

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 236

CE 021 839

TITLE The Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood. Panel Documents: October 31, 1978, January 23, 1979, February 28, 1979, April 9, 1979.

INSTITUTION George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Social Research Group.

SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Jun 79

CONTRACT 400-78-0044

NOTE 127p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Adult Development; Adult Education; Adult Learning; Adults; Adult Students; Agency Cooperation; Coordination; *Development; Educational Gerontology; *Federal Government; Geriatrics; Gerontology; Needs Assessment; Nontraditional Students; Postsecondary Education; *Public Agencies; Research; *Research Projects; Retirement

IDENTIFIERS Interagency Panel Research Development Adulthood

ABSTRACT

This report contains the proceedings of four sessions of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood (October 1978 - April 1979): (1) Postsecondary Education Reauthorization and the Adult/Nontraditional Learner, (2) Changing Socio-Demographics in the United States and Their Impact on Social Institutions, (3) Stress and Social Support throughout the Life Course, and (4) Cross-Agency Perspectives of Research and Development on Adulthood. The panel documents (and the meeting) provided forums for exchange and coordination among federal agencies having a research and development mandate in the area of cognitive and physical adult development. The complete text is provided for three presentations: "Overview by Activities in the Reauthorization of the Higher Education," "Old Age and Family Functioning," and "Research in Mental Health and Aging." The appendix, History of the Adulthood Panel: May 1977 - June 1978, contains notes from seven meetings of the panel. Topics include Lifetime Distribution of Education, Work and Leisure; Status of Research on Adult Development and the Limits of Human Educability; Population in Retirement and Approaching Retirement; Research Issues: Identification of Learning Needs of Adults; Occupational Mobility; Implications for Adult Development; Current Activities and Future Needs; and Human Competence from a Health Perspective. (YLB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED185236

THE INTERAGENCY PANEL FOR
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON ADULTHOOD

PANEL DOCUMENTS

October 31, 1978
January 23, 1979
February 28, 1979
April 9, 1979

Social Research Group
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C.
June 1979

The work upon which this publication is based was
performed pursuant to Contract NIE 400-78-0044 with
The National Institute of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AE024839

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE INTERAGENCY PANEL FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON ADULTHOOD

Panel Documents: October 1978 - April 1979

Postsecondary Education Reauthorization and the Adult/Nontraditional Learner. Dr. Michael O'Keefe, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation/DHEW, Keynote Speaker. October, 31, 1978.

Changing Socio-demographics in the United States and their Impact on Social Institutions. Ellen Lamparter, Office of Education/DHEW; Barbara Torrey and Douglas Norwood, Office of Management and Budget. January 23, 1979.

Stress and Social Support throughout the Life Course. Dr. Barry D. Lebowitz, Center for Studies of the Mental Health of the Aging, National Institute of Mental Health. February 28, 1979.

Cross-Agency Perspectives of Research and Development on Adulthood. Dr. Barry Lebowitz, National Institute of Mental Health. Dr. Harry Posman, Administration on Aging/DHEW; Dr. Charles Bunting and Ms. Carol Stoel, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education/DHEW. April 9, 1979.

Appendix:

History of the Adulthood Panel: May 1977 - June 1978

Lifetime Distribution of Education, Work and Leisure. Dr. Fred Best, Executive Director of Quality of Life Research Associates; Dr. Barry Stern, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education/DHEW. May 10, 1977.

Status of Research on Adult Development. Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, Department of Behavioral Sciences and Human Development, University of Chicago.

The Limits of Human Educability. Dr. Jerry L. Fletcher, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education/DHEW. June 13, 1977.

Appendix continued:

Population In Retirement and Approaching Retirement: Research Issues.
Mr. Joseph Coates, Office of Technology Assessment/U.S. Congress;
Mr. Hal Wallach, Bureau of the Census/DOC. October 12, 1977.

Special Presentation on Identification of Learning Needs of Adults.
Dr. Winthrop Adkins, Life Skills Center, Teachers College, Columbia University. Panel of discussants included: Mr. Judah Drob, Department of Labor; Dr. Charles Bunting, Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education/DHEW; Dr. George Pratt, Department of Commerce. December 6, 1977.

Special Presentations on Occupational Mobility: Implications for Adult Development. Mr. Robert Stump, National Institute of Education/DHEW; Mr. John C. Crystal, Life Management Services, Inc. January 10, 1978.

Presentations on Current Activities and Future Needs: Life Long Learning Report, Dr. Penny Richardson and Dr. Charles Bunting; Federal Council on Educational Research, Mr. Richard Werksman; Coordinating Committee for Research on Vocational Education, Dr. Charles Bunting; Research Agenda on Adult Education, Ms. Lana Muraskin. April 26, 1978.

Human Competence from a Health Perspective. Dr. James Bernstein, Health Corporation. Reactor Panel: Dr. Frank Corrigan, National Center for Education Statistics/DHEW; Dr. Jerry Turem, Office of Human Development Services/DHEW; Dr. Alice McGill, Office of Health Information and Health Promotion/DHEW. June 1, 1978.

POST SECONDARY EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION AND
THE ADULT/NONTRADITIONAL LEARNER

Notes from the Meeting of the Interagency
Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood

(Held October 31, 1978)

Keynote Speaker: Dr. Michael O'Keefe, OASPE/DHEW

Resource Persons: Mr. Michael Goldstein, Dow, Lohnes and Albertson;
Mr. Christopher Zachariadis, Clearinghouse for Community-Based Free Standing
Educational Institutions; Dr. Morris Keeton, Council for the Advancement of
Experiential Education; Mr. Martin Corry, IEL/Carnegie Project; Dr. William
Shannon, National Advisory Council on Extension & Continuing Education.

Edited by: Dr. Maure Hurt, Jr.; Ms. Justine Rodriguez.

Social Research Group, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.
January, 1979.

The work upon which this publication is based was preformed pursuant to
Contract NIE 400-78-0044 with The National Institution of Education.

ABSTRACT

The proceedings document summarized the discussion held at the October 31, 1978 meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood. The purpose of the meeting was to bring together interested Panel members, researchers/practitioners and members of the task force and working groups involved in the development of options for reauthorization of postsecondary education. Michael O'Keefe, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation/Education was the keynote speaker. He discussed the status and organization of the reauthorization. Following the keynote address, the areas of non-traditional postsecondary education considered were: (a) financial aid for part-time/non-traditional students discussed by Michael Goldstein, Dow, Lohnes, and Albertson; (b) eligibility of non-traditional institutions and their students, discussed by Christopher Zachariadis, Clearinghouse for Community-Based Free Standing Educational Institutions; (c) counseling, brokering, information, and assessment services, discussed by the group; (d) the role of experiential education, discussed by Morris Keeton, Council for the Advancement of Experiential Education; and (e) research, innovation, and dissemination, discussed by Martin Corry, IEL/Carnegie Project.

POST SECONDARY EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION AND
THE ADULT/NONTRADITIONAL LEARNER

Notes from the Meeting of the Interagency
Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood

(Held October 31, 1978)

Keynote Speaker: Dr. Michael O'Keefe, OASPE/DHEW

Resource Persons: Mr. Michael Goldstein, Dow, Lohnes and
Albertson

Mr. Christopher Zachariadis, Clearinghouse
for Community-Based Free Standing
Educational Institutions

Dr. Morris Keeton, Council for the Advancement
of Experiential Education

Mr. Martin Corry, IEL/Carnegie Project

Dr. William G. Shannon, National Advisory
Council on Extension & Continuing
Education

Edited by: Dr. Maure Hurt, Jr.
Ms. Justine Rodriguez

Social Research Group
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C.
January 1979

The work upon which this publication is based was
performed pursuant to Contract NIE 400-78-0044 with
The National Institute of Education

NOTES FROM THE MEETING OF THE INTERAGENCY
PANEL FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON ADULTHOOD
OCTOBER 31, 1978

The Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood met on the 31st of October 1978.

The Minutes of the last Panel meeting were approved as written.

Justine Rodriguez, Chairperson, provided an overview of the support contract and finances of the Panel over the next few months; noting that the annual support contract extends through March 24th of next year.

Edith Grotberg reported on the activities of the Panels on Adolescence and Early Childhood, relating to the efforts to find a sponsor other than ACYF.

The need for a Steering Committee was raised and a number of Panel members indicated an interest. The support staff will contact potential members of that committee in the near future. It was suggested that this committee also consider the need for nomination of Panel officers at a committee meeting to precede the next Panel meeting.

The next meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood will take place at 9:30 in Room 413-414 of the Marvin Center on January 23rd.

Postsecondary education reauthorization and the
adult/nontraditional learner

Agencies represented by Panel members have supported many research and development projects designed to increase the access of adults and other nontraditional learners to postsecondary education and to improve the match of such education with adults' needs. Panel members and researchers/

practitioners who have participated in some of these projects have expressed interest in discussing their experiences with members of the task force and working groups which are developing options for reauthorization of postsecondary legislation.

In the following proceedings Michael O'Keefe, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation/Education, outlines the status and organization of the reauthorization. After the O'Keefe comments six critical areas of non-traditional postsecondary education are considered, first by an invited guest acting as a resource person and providing an overview then with the topic open to general discussion.

The selected issues and the resource person are listed below:

- a. Financial aid for part-time/non-traditional students.

Mr. Michael Goldstein, Dow, Lohnes and Albertson

- b. Eligibility of non-traditional institutions and their students.

Mr. Christopher Zachariadis, Executive Director
Clearinghouse for Community-Based Free Standing Educational Institutions

- c. Counseling, brokering, information, and assessment services.

- d. The role of experiential education.

Dr. Morris Keeton, Executive Director
Council for the Advancement of Experiential Education

- e. Research, innovation, and dissemination.

Mr. Martin Corry, IEL/Carnegie Project

After self-introductions of those present, the discussion moved to the major agenda item, Postsecondary education reauthorization and the adult/nontraditional learner. Because of the quality and informational content of these presentations, they are presented in a proceedings form with only slight editing rather than in the form of abbreviated minutes.

Overview of Activities in the Reauthorization of
the Higher Education Act

Dr. Michael O'Keefe
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Planning and Evaluation/Education, DHEW

I am overseeing the review within DHEW of the Higher Education Act and the issues that present themselves in reauthorization of that legislation.

Our timetable currently calls for recommendations from the President to the Congress by sometime mid-February to mid-March, depending on the outcome of discussions with the White House staff and OMB. In DHEW our timetable has us making recommendations to the President by December. In the next month we'll be busy resolving postsecondary issues before we take our recommendations to the Secretary for his initial reaction. The Secretary in the past has generally sent the President a preliminary set of recommendations, then engaged in staff level discussions between the Department and OMB and the White House. The restructured recommendations become part of the Administration's package.

Our current anticipation is that the Congress will begin hearings on the Higher Education Act sometime this Spring. I believe the House will begin hearings about them, and we expect that those hearings will stretch through the summer and into next fall. Formal mark up on the bill may not take place until a year from now and maybe even beyond.

The Senate, to my knowledge, has not scheduled hearings so I think we can look forward beginning in February or so to another year's worth of discussion of some of these postsecondary issues.

Internally, we have had a dozen plus workgroups and individuals working on specific policy areas. There are a rather large number of programs in the Higher Education Act which expire, and so we have had to structure a fairly extensive effort. Let me sketch out several of the major areas in which we are dealing that relate to your concerns and interests.

In the area of student aid, we are working in a unique, and in some cases, a very constraining context. The Congress has just passed the Middle Income Initiative which the President put out about a year ago, which increased the costs in those student aid programs by about three-quarters of a billion dollars. That represents a large influx of money for education and means that we are going to have, realistically speaking, little in the way of new money for reform in those programs. There is also the possibility that the Congress might look upon that as its Higher Education effort in the student aid area, at least, for a period of time and will not really be terribly interested in restructuring those programs.

Our judgment is that within the student aid complex, the programs that are in serious need of rethinking are the loan programs. The Federal government has five or six reasonably sized loan programs for postsecondary education spread among the various agencies. Within the Office of Education we administered three now--the Guaranteed Student Loan Program, the National Direct Student Loan Program, and the new Health Education Student Loan Program. The programs have differing terms, repayment schedules, and incentives for employment in the field in which they are specified. They are administered by different agencies. The GSL and the Health Loan program are administered by OE, the National Direct Student Loan Program is administered by the campuses with collection undertaken by the campuses. So it is really a very complex structure and a very highly subsidized one. They are the major focus of our consideration with respect to the student aid programs.

I think our current purpose is to simplify those programs so that they do not have such complex administrative structures, especially in view of the default rate problem. In many instances, the default rate can be traced to the fact that no one even attempted to collect those loans, much less pursued them with any kind of vigor. As Secretary Califano keeps repeating to the Congress, it is a very un-American thing to pay bills that you haven't even been billed for. People don't tend to, in fact, pay off loans or debts that they have when no one is billing them or sending them any request for the monies.

At the same time, we are striving to create a system in which we make real the rhetoric that is inherent in the name of one of those programs, the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. Right now a Guaranteed Student Loan is not guaranteed to the applicant; it depends on whether there are banks willing to commit capital, and there are a very limited number of banks that are involved in this program. It varies highly by state; in some states money is readily available and in others very scarce.

One of our fundamental policy objectives is to make loan money available. One of our convictions is that the help middle-income families need in sending their children to college is in the form of cash flow rather than a matter of Federal subsidy. In other words, those families need some way to spread the costs, which can be quite substantial, of post-secondary education out over a period of time. The nation cannot afford it, nor does it make good solid public policy to provide very substantial subsidies to those families.

There are a number of other programs we are looking at in that complex. The College Work/Study Program is one that is a very popular program in the Congress and requires, I think, careful consideration of the role of work in the student's total financing package. There are two other grant programs--the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program and the State Student Incentive Grant Program, which are smaller issues for us and of much less concern that we have to do something drastic with them.

The Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program, which is the other major element of the student aid package of DHEW, is regarded as being a comparatively reasonable, sensible program. Among the policy issues is the question of what is known as the 'half-cost rule', the provision that no Basic Educational Opportunity grant can exceed half of the total cost of attendance for a student. This limitation has had a lot of debate. Also, there is the 'half-time rule,' which affects the non-traditional student in that funds are not available to people who are attending college less than half time. These are not seen as serious major structural issues which cause lots of conflict or political discussion.

We are also reviewing the other programs in the Higher Education Act. In particular, I might mention some of them that are of central interest. Title III, the Developing Institutions Program, has been, since it was created, a very controversial program. It does not do what it says it does. Yet the purposes of the program, if you read the Congressional intent and if you read the administrative history of the program, have been very clear. I think we should make some attempt to reconcile the difference between the actual and the intended effect, although politically it is a very difficult problem.

The Federal government has a plethora of graduate education, graduate fellowship and scholarship type programs, which pursue specific subject area and/or agency interests. These must be measured against the question of basic needs of graduate education in this country in the next decade or so and what kind of a role the Federal government should take. Ultimately, what kinds of programs can we realistically propose in view of the constraints upon us, both political and budgetary?

There is another type of program that is of interest to many of the people in this room; the three special service programs for disadvantaged children going into college. How do we really assure that kids who need them receive these services? Are there other ways than the existing programs to provide needed services. I think there are.

Teacher Corps is up for reauthorization again and will become a bit of a controversial issue because of the general perception that there is a surplus of teachers. A second issue, though less apparent in Washington, is the necessity to continually upgrade the quality of the teaching staff that is now in place.

Another area we are looking at rather broadly is a series of programs involving libraries. One provides virtually every post-secondary institution in the country with a grant on the order of \$3,000-\$5,000 per year for library services. The administrative structure to provide such a small amount of money to so many institutions almost boggles the mind. We have clearly got to take a look at that.

A major program of interest to this group is Title I, the Continuing Education Program. There we have a program which relates to the life-long learning thrust and to the question of what kind of leadership role the Federal government can provide. In my judgment we have some gaps in our postsecondary effort that need to be filled in. We have a relatively small level of research effort in postsecondary education at the NIE, mostly because of budget constraints. NIE's charter is certainly broad enough to encompass research and development in postsecondary education, but they have been very constrained by the available dollars. We have a very unique agency--the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education--which in my judgment has been one of the very successful new agencies. It has found a modus operandi that I think is unique in the Federal government; has kept itself flexible and lean, and made, I think, a real contribution. The Fund, though, is a small enterprise at present and given the small amount of resources available, has limited itself basically to providing program development support at the leading edge. FIPSE has targeted its resources on the creation of programmatic change. However, what we do not have in postsecondary education is any large source of funds for the actual installation of innovation or for supporting start-up costs in institutions in states and communities to do non-traditional or innovative projects.

The fundamental constraint in innovation is going to be money. In view of the state of the economy, I think the President is extraordinarily serious about a lean budget for the next couple of years. The indications are that the Congress is in accord. I think we may be reaching some kind of plateau, at least for the next couple of years, in terms of the expansion of education dollars. If you really want to do something new, you have got to oil the process with a little bit of money. You have got to, in a sense, hold constituencies harmless that may get hurt by that reauthorization. So I think that is a very serious constraint for us, and we will in the next couple of months really be encountering that issue as we try to deal with OMB.

As we look toward the next five years, the Federal government will provide a lot of money for postsecondary education. With the expansion of Basic Educational Opportunity Grants and the Middle-Income Initiative, the Federal government is providing in effect financial access to any student to a 4-year public institution in this country. Through the grant program at the outset and then combined with the other campus-based aid programs, and certainly combined with the loan programs, no one should, because of financial reasons, be unable to attend a public postsecondary educational institution through the first four years. That is a substantial accomplishment it seems to me, and it is a substantial contribution by the Federal government.

This universal access, however, brings some dangers with it. One of those dangers is that we are starting now to pump so much money in from the Federal level that, combined with the enrollment prospects of the next half decade or so, there are going to be a lot of incentives for institutions to go out and recruit and to really drag potential students in from the highways and byways. There will be a lot of Federal bucks attached to each of those kids they get in the door. There is a very strong set of incentives building in the system. This danger concerns us because we have a Federal structure which primes that pump, as it were. Yet we have very limited ways in which we can deal with the quality of 'education' that is going on in that enterprise.

Traditionally, the Federal government does not get very deeply involved in quality control. That is a campus-based responsibility. But a lot of what are labeled as innovative, postsecondary delivery systems may be very simply ripoffs of available funds that can come through the system. I think we need a way to deal with that kind of problem, but I don't have any good insights as to how to do so. The Federal government does not want to get intrinsically involved in quality control of postsecondary education yet there are a lot of people who talk about this issue. The problem becomes one of how to create some real change in a time of declining enrollments, in a time in which fiscal constraints are going to be severe, both for us and for the institutions.

Mr. Michael Goldstein
Dow, Lohnes and Albertson

I have been asked to deal with the question of financial aid for part-time and/or non-traditional students. Let me first approach this on a very general plane: I do not believe that the important issues surrounding financial aid for part-time or non-traditional students are ones of cost or administration. The issues are instead conceptual and definitional, ones which we have tended to assiduously avoid over the years. The true problems is that the traditional concepts and definitions of full/part-time or traditional/non-traditional are simply no longer applicable.

The credit (or contact) hour is no longer a particularly useful measure of involvement of non-traditional students in their academic program. Nor is the delivery of higher education any longer confined to a specific set of rules and standards, while the definition of that which is traditional and that which is not has become greatly blurred. Likewise, the definition of what comprises the non-traditional student has lost any sense of precision. The number of students, traditional or otherwise, who drop in and out of academic programs at a given point in time is steadily increasing, while many if not most of the students customarily defined as full-time are simultaneously in the world of work. Many students are full-time workers as well as ostensibly full-time students, and conversely a great many people in the workforce are part of the postsecondary education system.

What is really required is a new conceptual basis for the term "student", one which accommodates all those we variously classify as traditional or non-traditional, full- or part-time. Indeed, given the likelihood of continuing steady state financing of postsecondary education, this is a need which must be addressed prior to dealing with the substance of the various programs.

The problem of providing financial aid to the part-time or non-traditional student is tied up with the definition of a valid learning experience. The student pursuing a bachelors degree on a full-time basis may be reasonably expected to take a significant

number of course which are not vocationally oriented, and few would seriously challenge the reasonableness and indeed necessity of such a learning activity. But the student who may require eight or nine years to achieve the same educational outcome, and who happens to take a course in art appreciation, may well be labeled a dilettante. We must focus on whether what the student is learning is a valid part of his or her overall educational objective, not whether a specific (and relatively minute) element fits within a preconceived notion of what is or is not appropriate. The problem is that we have tended to look at the process of education rather than the product. We have examined whether a particular program has the requisite attributes and appearances rather than whether it provides the student with a valid and useful learning outcome.

In this context, the non-traditional or part-time student is different only insofar as the process of learning differs from that to which we have become accustomed. In assessing the validity of non-traditional programs (and learners) we must examine our own prejudices and preconceptions as to what we regard as education. Purely in terms of learning outcomes, there are no significant distinctions between traditional and non-traditional students, or between those who are full- or part-time. Thus, if we can move to a more outcome (product) oriented system, the definitional problems inherent in our present process oriented approach will greatly diminish.

If we accept the notion that from an outcome perspective there is no appreciable difference among types of learners and delivery systems (assuming reasonable standards for the quality of the outcome), then the question of the cost of extending federal financial aid to non-traditional and part-time students become far more manageable.

The objective of the student aid programs is to enable students with demonstrable need to obtain the education they need and desire. Limiting access to these programs on the basis of the academic process involved (as in the case of the 'contact hour' rules of the Veterans Administration) or the intensity of the time commitment

(as in the OE-administered rules requiring at least half-time status) does not make any sense from an outcome perspective.

The economic need of non-traditional or part-time students is no more difficult to assess than is that of any other group. I do not argue that these students deserve special treatment in access to these aid resources: simply that they are entitled to equality of access, limited only by their own demonstrable need. Assessing the financial need of an adult learner may technically be a far easier task than for the traditional college-age student, since matters of income, dependents and sources of support tend to be far more explicit. Indeed, the total cost of supporting a part-time or non-traditional student to achieve the same educational outcome may be significantly less than that presently accepted for a traditional full-time student, since the non-traditional student may, by virtue of a more flexible program, be capable of a more significant financial contribution.

The student financial aid programs are self-limiting in the sense that the level of need to which the programs can respond is controlled by the size of the applicant pool and the available resources. Were these programs to be extended to non-traditional and part-time students, the pool would admittedly be increased (although perhaps not as greatly as some have feared, since a certain number of presently full-time students might elect other options if support were available). But several studies have indicated that such an increase would not be immense, and in any event would still be limited by the size of the appropriation. That the Congress might have to increase the appropriate sum to accommodate all those with demonstrable need is likely, but is that not the intent of the legislation?

We are making a serious mistake in discussing the extension of financial aid resources to part-time or non-traditional students as though they comprised a separate and distinct group of learners. What is needed is a commitment on the part of the Federal government to providing financial assistance to every student who needs such support in order to achieve his or her educational objective. The only questions ought to be whether

the individual is engaged in a learning experience reasonably designed to achieve a definable educational outcome, and whether the learner is in need of financial support to accomplish that end. Nothing else is relevant; any other considerations are discriminatory.

Rodriguez: If we can define educational outcomes effectively and also judge what education is useful, do we not also have to define role and priorities in the Federal support of certain outcomes and not others?

Goldstein: Maybe the 'outcomes' issue is an area where NIE ought to become far more deeply involved, moving from the great emphasis on the examining process toward examining product. In terms of the allocation of scarce resources, the government already has a de facto set of priorities among outcomes. The current role says that the student in a traditional academic program achieves on accepted outcome, whatever it may be--but avoids defining it. Going beyond that becomes more difficult.

Obviously, if an outcome strategy were accepted completely, and we could validly assess outcome, there would be implications for the numbers of people to be prospectively served, and therefore implications for the economics. We are some iterations from that point. I think we need to look towards that, and maybe we will be making a valid argument that the Federal role needs to be to increase R&D in that direction and reallocation of funds in that direction. But we haven't looked at that. And that I think is the weakness.

Comment: In a system based on outcomes, would you comment on the student who goes in and takes any three credits?

Goldstein: I refuse to try to measure by numbers of credits. A student who wants to get three credits or three 'glimps,' or whatever the institution wants to call it, is doing something which we can measure as part of 'a valid learning experience' and certainly should be supported if the student has demonstrable need. Now, if a student would like to take a three-credit course in tiddliwinks, there ought to be some line somewhere that says the Government has no interest in supporting that activity. But that is very different from saying, the student

is below a certain diminishing level of learning in terms of our commitment threshold, and therefore ought not to be supported. I think the worker who can only take one course every other semester and clearly has an educational objective in mind, and has demonstrable need, has every right to that Federal support. And by saying, 'well you are just not taking it fast enough' to me has no rational basis.

Comment: If we take youth work as a case, where the Federal interest is in the unemployed youth, but there is a desire that the work serve as a learning experience as well, then you have got a case of something on the order of magnitude of three credits or less in any given three-month period. However, it is an appropriate thing to support, not because of credit, but because you need the youth employed, and he ought to be learning while he is employed to upgrade his employability.

Comment: The current Federal structure of student aid does not discriminate as much as is suggested against non-traditional learning environments. For example, the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program requires registration for credit and to be considered half-time becomes the Federal government's way of in fact assessing an outcome, namely, that there be credit. I think the change from half-time to any amount of time for credit would be a relatively inexpensive change, quite frankly. The other requirement that these programs impose is that you be at a formally accredited institution; that the student is within the institutional quality control mechanism that our society has created. Beyond that, there is not a whole lot of constraint built in there.

Comment: A question of how constraining the credit-half time enrollment actual is arose. A rejoinder was that the demand is not known because of the self limiting factor in the half-time constraint. There is evidence that a cash flow problem exists in the population which follow a work-enroll-work pattern and this same pattern places them beyond the BEOG program requirements.

Mr. Christopher Zachariadis
Executive Director
Clearinghouse for Community-Based
Free Standing Educational Institutions

I have been asked to address the issue of eligibility for nontraditional institutions. I will speak primarily to the type of institutions and programs that my organization represents and the difficulties that they are having with regards to eligibility. The parallels to other similar programs and organizations should be obvious.

The Clearinghouse is a national association of community-based educational institutions. We define "Community-Based" as those institutions that have evolved out of their communities, are controlled by the communities within which they operate, and gear their programs and services primarily to people within these communities. These institutions tend to serve low-income, out-of-the mainstream people, utilizing nontraditional methods appropriate to the environment, the background and interests, of their students.

In general, community-based educational institutions have a dual mission: education and community development. They fulfill this mission through a wide variety of programs ranging from college-level classroom instruction to neighborhood organization, and from intensive outreach and counseling to the development of economic development enterprises. This dual mission is also evidenced in their structures which include colleges, adult education programs, community development organizations and community action agencies. Collectively, they provide access to education to those neglected by the established, conventional system of education; they offer educational opportunities where there were none; they provide education that is consistent with individual and community aspirations; they have developed ways to respond to the unique needs of their students; they are actively involved in the development of their communities. In many respects they effectively respond to some of the most pressing social needs in education which have been expressed in existing public policy: quality education, access, equality of opportunity, and an effective social mission for educational institutions.

Yet, these institutions have by and large been excluded from participation in federal programs of support for education primarily because they do not meet eligibility requirements. Eligibility for programs supported through the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, is generally limited to those institutions that conform with Section 1201 (a) of the Act (definition of an institution of Higher Education) which places heavy emphasis on accreditation (or satisfactory progress towards accreditation) as a primary indicator. Among our member institutions only one is accredited. Of the more than twenty interested in accreditation, only six are candidates for accreditation. The main reason for this situation is that the voluntary nongovernmental system of accreditation had failed institutions that tend to depart from the conventional mold. Peer review, the primary mechanism of assessment of institutional effectiveness, has proven to be an illusion for most of our institutions because it has often meant review by non-peers using criteria and indicators that are inappropriate to their institutional purposes and missions. As a result many worthwhile programs have been excluded from the benefits of the Act.

There is no overt attempt in the Higher Education Act to define or dictate educational practice; yet, assumptions about the nature of learning, educational quality and appropriate delivery mechanisms are implicit throughout. Established colleges and universities are not only recognized as the primary mechanisms of educational delivery, but have also been anointed, through voluntary accreditation, the regulators of educational quality and accepted educational practice. This emphasis on the established system was appropriate in the early sixties when the Act was developed and it retains considerable merit today. But unweavering dependence on that system today, ignoring the many changes that have taken place in education since 1965, and despite a recognized powerlessness of the system to fulfill major national aspirations, inhibits the development of new, effective ways to meet national goals in education and wastes valuable resources.

There is a concern, almost a belief, that nontraditional means less quality. I contend that at least as many established programs will fail tests of quality using criteria appropriate to nontraditional programs, as nontraditional programs failing tests of quality using traditional criteria. The point I am making is that we lack good, universal, objective indicators of educational quality. What is unfair is to use those criteria and indicators that are acceptable in one set of programs on a different set without regard to their appropriateness. I believe that it is possible to develop universality applicable criteria and indicators of educational quality using outcome or performance measures. I was happy to see the COPA Study support this position. Peer review, genuine peer review, as an element of voluntary, nongovernmental accreditation is an effective way to fulfill these objectives.

At the same time, given the growing federal role in the support of education, I believe that it is a responsibility of the government to explain to the public what exactly it is supporting in education. The best that can be said about federal policy at this time is that federal dollars are used to support, directly or indirectly, institutions that have a certain reputation, whether deserved or not, for providing quality programs. Shouldn't federal support reach all quality programs irrespective of institutional reputation? I recognize the problems in implementing such an approach, but I feel that we are failing in our responsibilities to the public when we ignore worthwhile, promising approaches and allow them to die.

I will conclude with three recommendations:

- 1) Alter eligibility standards and criteria to focus on outcome measures rather than institutional reputation.
- 2) Support research to identify, document and explore the potential of the various educational programs and institutions now outside the established conventional system of education.
- 3) Establish a focused program of support of institutions outside the conventional system of higher education to help them stabilize their operation and institutionalize their programs.

Grotberg: The issue of quality of education, and the suggestion that the Federal government get involved in that raises questions. The role of the Federal government with regard to the quality of day care over the past 12 years became one of political issues rather than of quality. I would urge that you consider the role of professional organizations, the academic community, the local advocacy groups who should be articulating their desires for quality.

Your concern about higher education reflecting community needs and interests suggests the whole issue of pluralism leading to separatism. While it is easy to turn to the Federal government for solutions perhaps it is not the right organization to be addressing these problems. The complexity of Federal involvement provides no assurance either of education reflecting community wishes and desires except as it is kept fluid, nor that you can get quality except as the people who are involved in quality and are educated, if you will, toward quality of life get involved in these kinds of things.

Zachariadis: I am not suggesting the Federal government take complete control and tell local non-traditional institutions what needs to be done and what is going to be done. However, I do suggest that the Federal government should be able to state in very clear terms what it will support and to test both the traditional and the non-traditional educational institutions against those standards.

Keeton: In some areas the Federal government is already involved in quality control. The U.S. Office of Education's Office of Eligibility has set up qualitative standards, as to who may accredit, and those bodies that they have designated have in turn set up standards of quality control in the institutions. For example, the New York Board of Regents both operates institutions of higher education, acts as an accrediting body, and acts as a licensing authority--a very clear and substantial conflict of interest. I feel that the question becomes, Are there ways of minimizing or altering that involvement to provide for greater equity and to enable the non-traditional institution to function at an optimal level.

Question: Could you provide additional examples?

Comment: In the area of licensing standards, and the licensing standards are interlocked with the accrediting standards, there is Federal

quality control. That is a different and very complex area in which the Federal government in some of its programs requires the use of the state licensing standards in order to have Federal support. Also, the Veterans Administration approves every course that a veteran may take and be eligible for GI benefits.

Goldstein: The fact that the government has delegated to a quasi-public group responsibility for doing the accrediting does not mean that the government does not have the power and exercise that power in deciding how that accreditation is going to occur. There is nothing in the way that that power is established that would preclude the government from changing that process. For the present, they have chosen a means of achieving quality assurance. It is a governmental power that has been delegated, and I think we have to recognize that. The government is involved. The accrediting associations of the Middle States and North Central are acting as agents of the government of the United States.

I would like to suggest that this be not an item with a conclusion but agenda for additional questions. First start with the recognition that the Federal government is involved, ask the question: In what ways and to what extent, if at all, should it be involved? I think there is a need for study on that.

Question:
(To Zachariadis)

In terms of the non-traditional programs and institutions you are associated with, can you give us some sense of the magnitude or characteristics of people who can't get subsidy, but who would want it?

Zachariadis: I don't have any figures. However, for an exercise in extrapolation we have identified about 1,000 programs which could provide educational services in a community based process around the country. Our membership is only 35 but fairly diverse. The diversity among those 1,000 programs is immense. Those 35 groups that we serve provide direct educational services to more 100,000 people. Now if you want a non-traditional total, you can extrapolate from there.

Lord:

Certainly the most conservative estimate of the population of adults who are involved in something other than full- or half-time study in the United States in traditional institutions has got to be at the very least 12 million. Some percentage of the existing college population constitutes the various sub-populations of part-time students. We do know what constitutes aggregated part-time population, it's close to 60% now at the undergraduate level; at the graduate level it's about 75%. This suggests that there is already a population within the standard on-campus population who are not eligible for the benefits of Federal money because they are in fact part-time, but not half-time. In an extensive review of studies of barriers to part-time education perhaps 150 to 200 individual and state studies, on the basis of the respondents' answers to the questions with regard to barriers, finance is always either the first or the second reason. There is absolutely copious data on the fact that one expressed barrier by would-be learners or by existing involved learners is a financial one. There are others, and I don't think it is always possible to say just how valid that response is, but surely when it is so highly ranked by all of the people who are touched by these studies, it is significant. There are very conservatively at least 10 million adults in the United States who are very honestly but very partially involved in some kind of adult education. Thus it suggests that there is a role for the Federal government in this area.

Question: How many of that 100,000 in the non-traditional programs can't
(to Zachariadis) get money from the various Federal government programs?

Zachariadis: Using accreditation as a measure of eligibility out of the 35 groups that we serve, only one is accredited. Only five are candidates for accreditation. The rest are not. Most of their support comes from places like the Community Services Administration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Labor, not HEW. CETA and CSA money has been used to provide a lot of education/work experience and generate a lot of community development activities. However, the Office of Education does not recognize these programs as education.

Corry: In terms of some better measures, Pat Cross has done an excellent summary of about 30 or so state studies of adult education, and although each of the 30 or so studies asks the questions differently the study would give you some measure of demand.

O'Keefe: An alternative to a heavy Federal role in actually implementing a quality control process and defining outcomes would be to treat the education arena as a marketplace in which the Federal government would not get involved in direct action, but rather would require certain kinds of information and acts on the part of institutions such as developing a 'truth in education' document. The institution would provide both traditional and nontraditional information that the 'consumer' would need to decide whether to send their child there or whether he or she would want to go there. The information required would provide, for example, students who are interested in getting into the engineering curriculum with information on what the employment prospects are for graduates of that school of engineering and what their own chances would be for graduation.

There are indicators, and the institutions that have data relating to those indicators can make pretty good projections for students. For example, you have three chances in four to graduate from curriculum "X" with a C or better; or you have three chances in four of getting a D- in curriculum "Y", and here is what happens to people with D-s in curriculum "Y"--here is their employment opportunity.

It is a front-end kind of control that puts a lot of faith in the consumer's ability to deal with that information and make his own decision. It is a slow process in a sense; namely, it takes several cycles before the market corrects itself, before everybody starts to recognize the relative quality of an institution.

Comment: The 'truth in education' approach would still need some type of random or selected audit. The VA relies heavily, for example, on the college catalog. However, providing only printed material would not be enough. The accrediting bodies, all of which

require institutional self studies on a periodic basis, are in turn required in order to provide a back up system. If the accrediting bodies were to require consumer disclosure statements and to post-audit those when they do their site visits, you would already have a highly decentralized enforcement mechanism in place. However, further refinement would be necessary.

Rowe: There is, it seems, some precedent in current regulations for entering into this general area of requiring that consumer information be presented to students as a part of the institution's ability to get administrative costs out of a student financial aid program. The major question, though, is the quality of what the students are being told, and who is going to test whether the institutions are telling the truth. On a parallel track, when there are breaches under a particular set of student aid regulations, an institution can be barred from receiving continued support through student financial aid. However, it seems that accrediting agencies have concentrated more at the 'front end', on the original accreditation than on re-examination to see if accreditation will be continued. It is very difficult to suggest particular formats for or degrees of intensity for reviews or which areas they should cover.

Lord: I think the Middle States, the North Central, and the Southern accrediting bodies have considered establishing a separate group with separate identification of criteria for evaluating nontraditional programs. Perhaps there is a way for the Federal government to stimulate that activity.

Keeton: The North Central Executive Board for Institutions of Higher Education has deliberately gone against the idea of treating non-traditional institutions as separate categories for purposes of the accrediting process. The Southern Association has deliberately gone the other way and has a thing called Standard Nine on Non-traditional Institutions. As a matter of fact, Standard Nine recommends use of a set principles of good practice in assessing experiential learning.

The current task group on the evaluation of non-traditional institutions has made the observation that the distinction between traditional and non-traditional is no longer a functionally useful distinction for purposes of accreditation. What the Southern Association will do with the implications of that is not known. The organizational position of Middle States has been somewhat in the middle, between North Central and Southern on assessment.

Rodriguez: The next area is counseling, brokering, information, and assessment services. Since the resource person was unable to be here, are there comments in that area?

Weldon: I think the acceptance and growth of brokering has proven the validity of the process, although it has served a relatively small number of people across the country. This acceptance and growth would indicate there is a great need for institutionalization of the counseling/brokering process.

Corry: There is a national meeting in the planning stage, to look at the range of information and counseling services which are federally-funded, state-supported, and independent. Representatives at the planning meetings have come from the new NOICC and SOICC networks, from the Career Information Services, from the independent brokering agencies, from the state Educational Information Center coordinators, from the Trio programs--perhaps some 12 to 15 federally-authorized information and counseling services. These groups have met as part of a planning group for a conference to be held in Denver.

One of the top items on the agenda is to look at reauthorization of the Higher Education bill, where a number of the programs originate, to see how there might be some coordination, with Labor support, of the programs. A major interest of that group is reauthorization of modified Educational Opportunity Centers, Educational Information Centers, and Trio programs. Another issue is the cost of counseling and information services and how student aid money might be made available through Higher Education authorizations to support these services as well as instructional services. This issue becomes of greater concern as more people are availing themselves of such services. A corollary issue is: how might some of these services be made available to people who really need them as their first step toward getting back to school.

available to people who really need them as their first step toward getting back to school.

Comment: From another viewpoint, I wondered is anyone looking at the possible impact of the Age Discrimination Act and the ramifications on the reauthorization issues we have talked about. In answer to the question of discrimination against older persons, in the student loan and other areas, we were not discriminating because it did not say anything about age; it had no age restriction. Yet there is a statement from the National Council on Aging pointing out exactly how very restrictive the current regulations are, for example, in their requirements on the parents' ability to support the student and the requirement for working toward a degree on some specified plan.

The potential older learners are not happy just to think about access as students, they also want to think about access as making some contribution either in planning or helping to plan the learning experiences involved. Many of them are quite knowledgeable in many areas, and they would like access to delivering some of the information. So there is potentially a very interesting problem area, and it seems that there are very few if any people in HEW looking at this. It is quite possible there will be some very interesting test cases of lack of access to education.

Mr. Morris Keeton
Executive Director
Council for the Advancement of
Experiential Learning (CAEL)

What is experiential learning? Experiential learning, as defined by CAEL, is that in which the learner is directly in touch with the realities being studied. It is not necessarily out-of-classroom; for example, studio work in the arts is experiential learning. Laboratory work in sciences, if not cookbook, but genuine inquiry, is experiential learning. Internship in teacher education, of course, is experiential learning; the clinic in surgical and medical education is another example. Education that is not experiential learning is simply hearing about "it," writing about it, talking about it, but not being in touch with it.

Why is experiential learning necessary? Some of the major reasons quickly?

- o For values clarification. It is essential for the reliable discovery of work interests, preferred citizen roles or other preferred life roles and styles to try the activity and see. At Antioch College we found that the actual tryout in the work situation moved our students very rapidly to awareness about their own preferences in work and their own tolerance, that no amount of counseling, talking, and studying would provide.
- o For skill development and the mastery of more complex competencies or capabilities. It is obvious in the case of skill development that practice is essential. But it is even more important in complex capabilities such, for example, as advocacy in the legal profession. Of course, the Antioch School of Law is the most radical of experiments in that respect, but all over the country nowadays more attention is being paid to the fact that the main tradition in law schools was to train legal researchers, not legal advocates; and that if advocates are what we are talking about, the skills of negotiation, of client understanding and advocacy in the court are very complex and must be practiced under expert supervision to be learned.
- o For the motivation of most learners and the power to energize the learning effort. There is nothing like participation in an internship with a Congressman to motivate the student in the political sciences. Or experience with a disturbed child, either to let a person know that he or she does not want to work with disturbed children, or to

really generate a drive that is unquenchable around that task.

- o To enable the learner to grasp the implications in practice of abstract theory and thus get the actual meaning of the theories. In a senior seminar in ethical theory, for example, seniors were asked if it was ever justifiable to impose one's values on another person. Oh, absolutely not, everybody said.

They were then asked where they had last worked. Several of them had worked in counseling clinics, some in a Freudian-oriented clinic, others in a Rogerian-oriented clinic. In the ensuing discussion the two groups soon discovered that when they consulted their own experience regarding their abstract theory in the field of ethics, they couldn't reconcile the two; they had to do something about that contradiction.

- o The power of experiential learning to fix something in the mind. If you have handled it and done it, it is generally much more memorable than if you have only read about it.
- o Higher levels of cognition require the synthesis of theory and the experiential elements. Knowledge is a composite of theoretic and empirical elements. All the higher levels of cognition such as those involving application, evaluation, synthesis, or integration require the interplay of the two.

How are these values related to different learning styles? For some learners it is better, instead of starting in what we traditionally think of as the logical way, (that is, defining the terms, talking about the facts), simply to plunge them into an experience that arouses curiosity. For other learners, it seems to work the other way. They

are keen information assimilators; they already have, for some reason or other, that kind of interest that they needed in order to force them to test the implications of their theories in reality situations and to prevent them from oversimplifying and ignoring the context.

So the point of view that I represent on this topic is that we are really talking about an education that is not inferior. An education that lacks an appropriate mix of experiential is simply an inferior education.

Should the opportunities for experiential education be expanded? In the light of what I have just said, obviously, definitely and substantially, they should be.

But a more important question than the one of increase is the one of the astute design and use of the experiential elements. That's where the focus of effort needs to be put. For instance, about the sixth time you carry out the bedpan you don't learn anything more from that unless it has to do with something about human relations to which the bedpan is only incidental. So a lot of experience is just repetition of the same thing over again and ceases to have pedagogical value.

Who can best benefit from experiential education? Some learners need it most for some purposes and other learners for other purposes, but it is not a question of who needs it most; it is essential to all good education. No learning program that is aimed toward the mastery of a discipline or a profession can be adequate without an appropriate infusion of experiential encounters. So if one looks at this question in terms of whole degree programs or whole preparation cycles for either occupational functions or life functions, citizenship functions, roles in personal life, there is no avoiding this need.

'Should Federal support be provided and if so, how?' was a question that was put to me. First, should it be? I would say not because experiential learning per se should be singled out for support any more than information processing should be,

but because it is essential to meeting the needs that have just been specified above. Insofar as the Federal government should be involved in support of quality education, there is an unavoidable involvement. Then one needs to begin to look at what the nature of that involvement should be. It seems to me that one way of thinking about that now would be that there is a need for undoing some discriminatory or inequitable arrangements--some arrangements in the present law and regulations that prevent doing what is thought best by the institutions and the professors in their own craft. Among those we have talked about were those affecting the part-time learner.

Another category is the off-campus learner where some of the regulations and provisions are in the way. An example that we don't often like to talk about very much in this field is the cooperative education legislation, which is a case of supporting a special kind of experiential learning. It has been so interpreted and administered that Antioch College, which is the second most ancient institution using cooperative education, could not relate that aid to more than half of its activity in the last decade--the definition was so narrow as to the form of cooperative education supportable. I would think that a search needs to be made for that kind of problem, and there is no cost involved except that of rectifying that problem.

The encouragement of innovation, including innovations in an area like quality control where it can be done without intruding into the content of the standards--the disclosure strategy, for instance--seems to me to be an excellent and appropriate strategy for federal involvement in the sense that consumer protection and legal equity, or the avoidance of inequity, are proper functions of the Federal government.

Supporting technical assistance and dissemination for already proven ideas where there is a desire on the part of the institutions and the professionals to do these things, but a difficulty with getting into it, is an appropriate function. I wouldn't imagine that incentive grants to the accrediting bodies that are already committed to

outcomes assessment but do not have enough budget to do professional development of their accreditors would be another example of the kind of thing that might be appropriate.

Some effort, perhaps, is in order to foster cost-effectiveness in higher education services. I might stop on that one for a moment. I think that the Corry paper shows that most of the Federal government's engagement in support of education historically has been for some other reason than supporting some particular idea or other about good education. Some of it has been to support equal opportunity, some of it has been to support veteran reorientation to civilian life, some of it has been around defense needs, some of it around the industrial and economic capabilities of society.

If we would look at the current 10 or 12 highest Federal priorities for the next five years in President Carter's thinking--whether they have to do with fostering international peace, the conservation and production of energy, the protection of the environment, the arrest of inflation--in all of these things there is a need for person-power, in which people could also be engaged in learning efforts. I would suggest that certain proportions of the allocations to these substantive Federal priorities there be a requirement that there be 'piggybacking' of an educational function on them. This is already in place, for instance, a youth unemployment priority where the concomitant need to learn is a part of the employment activity.

Take the assumption that the percentage of the gross national product devoted to postsecondary education will probably either not rise at all or rise very, very slowly from here on to the next decade. If one would then say, array the agenda of what is needed in the field and see to what extent it could be piggybacked on the other Federal priorities, that might be a very useful strategy for support.

I have listed some other details about the kind of things that might be considered, but I think they are examples of these more general strategies. For example, pilot efforts to develop and

publish inter-institutionally shared standards of competence and knowledge related to degrees or certificates would be a useful contribution to the quality control idea that would not involve the Federal government in making a statement itself as to what is good.

Another idea is supporting at the secondary level a CAEL-like system of services (Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning). CAEL helps its member institutions to know better how to do valid and reliable assessment of what learners know and can do, whether they learned it with the institution or elsewhere. It helps the institution to learn how to state, in a publicly understandable way, what its own expectations and standards are. What I am saying is that at the secondary level there is probably a need for that kind of function especially around legislative concerns that the government not pay twice for the same education. For example, in Florida when some colleges reported that their students couldn't read at the ninth grade level, the Florida legislature objected saying that the state had already paid for that learning once. Why should they be paying for reading instruction in the community colleges and state universities again? Well, they didn't get it the first time they paid for it; some help to the secondary level institutions in disclosing what is actually being achieved might help on that problem.

In the long run we will probably have a bill of rights for learners of all ages and conditions for which there is already a precedent in Federal legislation. If one takes the language of the Act on the Handicapped and simply substitutes person for handicapped person it makes a very good statement of currently thoughtful educational philosophy. For instance, individualization is expressed there as a matter of policy; equitable treatment is expressed as a matter of policy. It would be absolutely unthinkable to fund such a bill of rights at this time, we are so far from realizing it. But in terms of the guiding approach to the long-range need, it seems to me that there is already a precedent in the existing legislation

If one would look to the possibilities of recognition of learning in terms of the learner's competence and knowledge, you might keep a very heavy burden from falling upon the Federal and state budgets and the institutions of higher education. The Peterson and Cross 1978 book says that 80% of the learning of adults takes place informally; and here learning refers to projects involving 500 hours a year on the average. Also stated is that within the other 20% representing formal learning, 72% takes place in non-collegiate settings.

Question: Please explain or define the difference between the CAEL member institutions and the universes of institutions that are cooperative education schools and how they differ, or are similar? It would seem there are some ways of solving both the financing problem and advancing the concept of experiential learning for adults. It suggests much thought should be given to utilizing this unique delivery or educational system, and at the same time drawing upon the productive work and the earnings that could occur and to using these earnings as a financial device for expanding the means for the student.

Keeton: CAEL is now 304 member institutions. In a recent survey of their practices, it turned out that of the ones having sponsored experiential learning programs, 40% were cooperative education.

As to the nature of the CAEL membership, it has a higher proportion of doctoral degree granting institutions than is typical of the college population as a whole, about 18% higher. There is about a 10% higher proportion of 4-year colleges relative to 2-year than is typical for the country as a whole, but it has a mix of all types. For instance, 27% of the membership is made up of community colleges. CAEL is somewhat long on public institutions and a little short on private institutions. Otherwise, it is fairly characteristic of the establishment. For instance, the same percentage of CAEL institutions were founded before 1900 as there were in the set of higher education institutions as a whole. Although some of us suspected

that there might be, shall I say, a higher percentage of the 'kooks' than of the 'troglodytes.' It seems that we have everybody, not always exactly the usual proportions, but they are there.

Your second question had to do with taking advantage, if I understood you correctly, of the fact that in many experiential learning programs there is an earning component or could be. That is certainly an important consideration. In a straight alternating work/study institution, for instance, Antioch College, we discovered that by switching to a year-round calendar at one point in the late 1950s we were able to increase the income by 33% and increase the cost by only 10%, and did so.

In a quite different kind of example, CAEL had a call recently from one of the steel firms, which has plants in five different areas in the country. They wanted to know if their in-house entitlements to educational support could gain their workers prior learning assessment and recognition on an advantageous basis and whether we could help them identify institutions that will do that assessment competently. We are certainly going to respond to that request. What the question points to immediately is that with industry ready to support the continuing education of its workers and not all of it just for on-the-job improvement of performance, if you can offer them a best buy in that respect, their money is going to be more readily available nor does the cost hit the Federal government or the state budgets directly.

For the learner, of course, when he is earning, he is also in need of a lower volume of immediate cash support from other sources. One of the things that is fairly typical in cooperative education is that you can spread the financial aid over a larger number of people for the same amount of dollars. If that is linked to youth work, CETA, etc. and the learning is piggybacked, then of course if it is assessed and recognized you have helped meet the obligation that the government has undertaken in providing free public education.

I was going to propose as an improvement that the Federal government guarantee an entitlement to all adults who were able

and willing, of the equivalent of two years of outcome-defined postsecondary education, and felt that that would constitute an upgrading of the entitlement. In view of Michael O'Keefe's statement concerning the current four year entitlement what must be happening is that we have what I would call a substantial built-in discrimination against the learner who does it outside college, remembering the Peterson and Cross statistics that said that 72% of the formal learning occurs outside the college and university context presently. Another way of putting the point is that the traditional establishment of higher education is in the minority in providing the higher education services in our society. If the Federal government is trying to understand the education industry and to stimulate, regulate, and support it in the ways that fit the Federal policy, it needs to move beyond that initiative of--was it '72--when it changed the name from higher education to postsecondary and examine the implications of the fact that indeed postsecondary education is approximately 350% the size of higher education.

Mr. Martin Corry
IEL/Carnegie Project

I have been assigned the task of discussing dissemination, networking and technical assistance.

Dissemination for most people who are involved in running a federally funded program is a little piece of 'boilerplate' tacked on to the end of each contract. It calls for dissemination and reports to be submitted and distributed, and then may add that the Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse (ERIC) receive a copy. For most of the innovative or experimental programs funded through categorical aid that is where dissemination begins and ends.

We need to do very much more than that given the investment we are making in these programs as well as innovative practices which are supported through other programs, such as Trio.

Effective dissemination means not only sending out printed material but also helping through technical assistance to enable people to learn directly about effective programs. Let me point to two models. The first is the one used by the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education in the so-called 'National Project'. The Fund identified successful programs around which they organized a network. In addition to providing a certain amount of support for further development and validation of the innovations, the National Projects format also provided a highly visible means through which others, who had not been involved in this type of program previously, could plug into.

Within the context of the national commitment to equal educational opportunity the question is now being posed whether the next step is a broader push for support of retention activities. The federal government spends billions for student aid and related access-oriented programs. The Federal government has supported a lot of attrition-reduction programs since 1965 through Trio programs, through some of the Fund programs, and through research at NIE and its predecessors. It would be helpful for retention purposes to place the Federal spotlight on those. Thus providing some opportunities to showcase what they have done, how they have worked, for what kinds of students and so on. For example, an institution which has developed a highly successful retention program, could invite others to visit a campus for two or three days and work with them in implementing a program. This might be followed by modest amounts of seed money for institutions to attempt similar programs.

With declining enrollments it is certainly in the interest of most institutions to reduce attrition rates. At the same time, however, they are often constrained due to limited or no access to current information about effective programs.

A second model to which we might look for effectively communicating about new programs is the Exxon Impact Program. The lag between an effective innovation and its adoption in the

field tends to be very long. Research shows that there is something in the range of 25 to 50 years, in many cases for replication of certain types of 'innovations'. About five years ago, the Exxon Education Foundation, finding--as many grant agencies do--that they had put a lot of money out in the field to support hundreds of proposals. Some of it had been for naught; some of it though had resulted in useful, effective programs. Exxon identified four of what they deemed to be successful counseling and instructional programs, some using computer simulation. In essence, they put the Foundation's seal of good housekeeping on the four innovations and spotlighted them. They paid the 'inventors', as they referred to them, who had designed the programs to prepare a packet of information describing their innovations. Exxon then advertised the programs nationally. People were invited to write to the 'inventors' to receive, at no cost to themselves, the packets of information if they were interested in pursuing a similar type of program at their institution.

They got a large response to that offer and then invited a smaller group of people to a series of workshops run by each of the 'inventors'.

From that somewhat smaller group, they then extended the opportunity for a small implementation grant. Since the groundwork had been laid, since the validation of the method had been conducted, what was needed was not new experimentation but some installation with appropriate adaptations to individual institutions. After reviewing proposals from several hundred institutions, small grants of up to \$6,000 were provided. For a maximum of \$6,000 several hundred institutions implemented new means of individualized instruction, or new means of peer-to-peer counseling.

Exxon built in evaluation from the outset. They kept good records of who had been in contact with them, and found that not only obviously did they get a good record of implementation after they made the grants, but those who simply came to a workshop and who had no further contact with Foundation and perhaps only

limited contact with the inventor also had a significant degree of implementation taking the program material and what they had learned at the workshop and installing it in their own institution.

There are obviously other models. One which I would like to mention is Nexas, which was, until its demise in May 1978 due to financial malnutrition, a user response system which kept track of people and programs and then referred individuals by giving them the names, telephone, address, and a little bit of background information on those programs which would respond to their questions.

As a recommendation, in view of the total investment which the Federal government has made in categorical programs, one could select three or four issues a year with a FIPSE type of mechanism and get some replication at a relatively low cost. Convening a national conference with some prestige attached to it provides invisible rewards to an institution, especially by having been designated as having a good program; likewise receiving a small amount of seed money. Even the fact of having been invited to a conference and wined and dined for a day or two to learn something is an incentive. Using the Federal 'spotlight' and a modest amount of seed money for replication will increase the adoption of federally-supported projects already generated by those at the cutting edge of innovation.

Question: Given the declining enrollments and shrinking dollars, how do we implement the results of some cutting edge experimentation and how do we provide access and quality control?

Keeton: In terms of quality control, there is an example in the field of non-traditional, innovative or experiential education. Several years ago there were hundreds probably even thousands of institutions and organizations doing some type of evaluation of experiential learning, all but a few of them very badly. Through a grant from a number of foundations a group of practitioners in the field were brought together both to stimulate the type of program that was being conducted, but more importantly to actually try to develop some better, some more effective measures of evaluating experiential learning. A situation existed where countless campuses were evaluating or giving credit, and thereby Federal and state dollars, for all types of experiential and prior adult learning. Now if you look at many of those institutions who have been involved with CAEL over the years, you find that the rigor with which they

evaluate, and thereby account to the public is much more worthwhile than it had been several years ago. It required a lot of money at the front end and the continuing involvement of the institutions. However, it is a good example of replication, innovation, and of quality control without getting into lots of heavy Federal expenditures.

Comment: Let me emphasize one point, that is, the importance of technical assistance. There are a number of other studies that have been done by the Office of Education and NIE that stress the role of the linking agent. Money and information is important, obviously, but having a linking agent there who can interpret and respond to the questions of the practitioner in light of the research or innovative program findings, who has credibility, who makes it a point of being accessible, seems to be a very important ingredient that often gets neglected.

Question: Is this type of technical assistance expensive?

Comment: It is expensive to the extent that you have to persuade the user institutions to put some dollars out to keep that person going.

Comment: It is also expensive any time you get into this sort of field because you don't know how many of the potential recipients of information are going to eventually adopt it. But given the size of the investment which the Federal government has already made in innovation, it seems worthwhile. Certainly it is a waste of money not to try to develop some better mechanisms to go the next implementation step, having gone so many steps before and to try to maximize that investment.

Keeton: A number of you know who have been at it, it takes a lot of patience, a lot of this is a matter of gradually getting attitude changes among the power holders in the institutions. The CAEL Institutional Development Program posits a 3-5 year effort by each member institution to effect change. Sometimes in the first year we can't even elicit a definition of what will be accomplished in that effort from the institution. You have to get through certain committees, but first you have to get the commitment of an academic vice president to even let the committee process go forward. You have to get enough faculty members who understand

the concept and are able to keep their eye on the target. Then from time to time you have to bring in somebody from the outside who will re-energize the process. In CAEL, the institutions pay a good share of the cost of that. Out of the present annual budget, about 30% of the \$1 million will come from institutional contributions, not counting their 'in kind' time, and so.

Goldstein: Providing the incentive to the institutions is really the key problem. It is one thing to make material available and accessible, and something else to get someone to read it and to do something with it.

Cooperative education is a very good example of an economic incentive. If you, the student, will try this, we will pay you to do it. The problem is the feasibility of that, given our current economic situation is limited. What is needed is good information on what is available. Secondly, to try to find those incentives that encourage the people to make use of it. There has got to be something that puts it in people's self interest to adopt something that takes a bit more work or maybe a bit more risk.

Mark: A parallel point to that is that we have got to develop some kind of a mechanism for both state and Federal holders of grant money to convince them that dissemination and replication money is in fact programmatic. The major problem we have in our program, which is a State's Grant Program, is that the states are saying we only have enough money to do program work.

Corry: Although in many of the programs there is some mention of dissemination, I would favor with some use of panels and readers, again the way NIE and your office and the Fund operates, to identify what have been effective programs. In some ways we are wasting money in putting clauses into contracts calling for dissemination of what may have been a disastrous project. To give them money to go out and spread that around maybe a disservice rather than an aid.

We need some system that relies on both the expertise of the projects officers themselves as well as some outsiders who are

familiar with that type of program to select X number of programs a year, hopefully related to some other Federal themes or goals like retention or equal opportunity, and highlight those.

Comment: The joint dissemination review panel doesn't let much get through out of the thousands of things that go through that process. I don't know whether that speaks well for the panel, or speaks poorly for the projects submitted.

Corry: A few people have mentioned the declining enrollments in higher education and/or postsecondary education. I think we need to look pretty carefully at just what that means. In fact in some states it will not be declining, in most states there will be great variability among types of institutions. Even if one accepts the notion on the aggregate level of decline, you have to look a little more closely at who those younger students are. There are definitely going to be less 18-24-year-olds. However, there will be an increasing proportion of low-income and minority students, and particularly Hispanics. In the next few years, Hispanics will soon outnumber the Blacks in this country as a minority. Those groups who frequently begin with an educational disadvantage will be in institutions in greater numbers and they will be a new challenge to the equal opportunity thrust.

Rowe: There have been some dramatic increases in areas of student aid that seem to have a potential for work/study support. It is my feeling that the higher education institutions have not taken advantage of this potential, perhaps only 15 to 20 percent of their students are involved in off-campus experiential learning. Could this be because student aid originates in the student aid offices rather than in the more academically oriented sectors of the institutions?

Keeton: The work element in the work/study programs certainly contributes to students' learning, so I think your point is very good, and I would actually favor building incentives into the language of the law or the regulation to foster the effective use of that, to get learning as well as financial aid.

Goldstein: Work/study is a great example of a statute that was enacted in this case under the Economic Opportunity Act, with lots of fanfare about how it was going to be not only financial aid, but giving a student an opportunity to experience the real world as part of their education and provide public services. Then it was transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity into the Office of Education, and in the process became purely a financial aid program and eliminated all of its education attributes. The regulations and the administration of the program are sharply antithetical to the use of the program as anything but financial aid. The statute is silent with regard to work/study, but it is silent in a less than encouraging way. It seems to me that cooperative education is viewed as a learning experience and work/study is viewed as a financial aid effort and n'er the twain shall meet.

In terms of disincentives for nontraditional part-time students, a program like work/study with half a billion dollars of funds available to it is warping everything else. Other types of programs available in this area have been used trivially. It would need a minor adjustment to the statute and some major re-educating of people who were running the program, both in the agencies and in the college to make that not only do its financial aid job but also support nontraditional experiential learning with the same dollars.

The problem is getting change to occur. If the incentive in the university is to use the program, on-campus, or for inexpensive labor, or for easily assembled programs and the government is content to have some kids to sweep floors, that's fine--send them out there. However, if you have to look at the academic aspect of the program, that is going to cost money. The government can encourage program assessment, but then there has got to be something that builds in incentive, either punitive or a form of assistance to cause the assessment to happen.

Question: Is there not a section or a subsection in the current work/study program that provides for job development?

Comment: Yes. The problem is that as the legislation was written, and again the legislative history infer job development, it doesn't say other

than work/study, it implies other than work/study. Although it talks about the economics of developing a job, it does not talk about the jobs in any relationship to learning. There was a marvelous opportunity to build in something in again at zero cost, and provide an incentive to the institutions for a more effective use of work/study and more effective use of experiential learning generally. Yet the people who planned and administered the program at the institutional level were not concerned with work/study other than as financial aid.

Dr. William G. Shannon, Executive Director
National Advisory Council on Extension
and Continuing Education

The National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education is composed of 20 members, 12 of them Presidentially appointed, 8 representing Government departments--Commerce, Labor, etc. Its mandate under Title I of the Higher Education Act is to review and overview Title I activities, including continuing education activities, life-long learning activities that have anything to do with the Federal government or that may be sponsored in some part, directly or indirectly, by the Federal government. But actually the purview of the Council goes beyond that into all sorts of postsecondary activities related to continuing education and extension-related education. We are responsible for overseeing Title I, the work of the Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education and the many State administrators around the country. This is done formally and less formally at various times depending upon the situation. For example, we have reviewed Title I work in the various States through some hearings that were held during the past year. On the basis of those hearings we are now proposing some changes in the Title I legislation. The Council is reviewing the Higher Education Act with the intent of making some input into the discussion of the reauthorization of the Act. That is going to be our major item on the agenda for the next few months, as it is for many of the other agencies in the Federal government, or related to the Federal Government.

In a review made not too long ago, we found out that there are approximately 400 programs sponsored by the Federal government dealing with continuing education broadly interpreted. These relate primarily to professional development and upgrading in

the health fields and so on. So if you take a broad interpretation of continuing education you can see the Federal government involved in many, many aspects of that world. Title I is only one facet of it. One of the Council's responsibilities is to provide information, ideas and policy recommendations to the White House, to the Administration, to Congress, etc. And so we have a quasi-political role to play. Because of that situation, I think we have a unique leverage and opportunity to work not only in the political world but in the educational world. We serve as a bridge between the Administration and Congress at a low key, while not trying to build this up particularly as a political gambit. However, we are mandated by Congress to act in that capacity.

I think that one of the problems we face in looking at Title I specifically is that the Congress has funded it over the years and yet the Administration comes out for no funding. There seems to be an inconsistency as we look at this situation and see one entity saying, yes, we will continue to fund this because we feel there is a need, and on the other hand the leaders of education in the U.S. Government not coming out forthrightly for funding of the program.

Now although there are reasons for it, there is a gap here, and the Council is going to try in some way to bridge this gap that exists. It is more than a communications gap; it is a problem of the HEW policy groups not attending to the situation. While not predicting the outcome, I think this is one of the areas that should receive more official attention on the part of the workgroups on Title I and continuing education generally. That's one element of the Council's concern.

We find that, generally speaking, continuing education is a pay-as-you go proposition in this country. You can have continuing education opportunities if you can pay for them at a particular institution nearby. But we find that while the percentage of blacks involved in continuing education is diminishing, the percentage of whites is going up. We don't have sufficient data about the unserved groups. We need a lot more data about the barriers to them for entry into the education system.

I am not just talking here about formal education, but broad educational opportunity.

One of the Federal interests, of course, is access; and one of the Federal priorities is dealing with low-income groups. Our concern here as a Council is to try to focus, within the context of the Federal priorities, and to determine or suggest or recommend what policies might be effective in helping people get the kinds of education they might want.

In response to a question that was asked earlier, how do we know out there who wants education, and what kind do they want? We just don't know sufficiently for our satisfaction. But as an estimate, we figure that there are about 17 million people that would benefit from some type of assistance to help them get into educational programs. But again we need a lot more data, and I understand that there is some research now trying to determine what the needs actually are. Through the Council's offices, we are now trying to suggest that the Administration and the Congress--Congressional staff in particular--start talking about the implications and funding of Title I. We feel that perhaps a more intelligent mode might be established with respect to what should happen to Title I, not just in the funding but in its nature and makeup.

The Council is now reviewing Title I to see what might it be, and not just to review what it has been. The Council does have a responsibility to do a little blue-sky dreaming, although it must also keep in mind the practical, political systems within which we are working and try to come up with something that is practicable, as well as educationally effective.

In addition to looking at Title I and the rest of the Higher Education Act through a special ad hoc committee, we are going to be looking at Title IV and student financial aid. We will be reviewing not just the present system, but who are the unserved groups, and what is needed in the way of Federal policy to enable people from low-income groups or areas to come into the educational field.

Another very intriguing area that we are looking at is the whole private sector. And there are some fascinating questions now being raised by economists and others dealing with a couple of things that were alluded to earlier, a life-long learning bank or educational opportunity bank, which you can tap at certain points in your life.

Another of the ideas we were thinking about is one that was already touched on: Is it possible to set up an "Educational Impact Act" similar to the Environmental Impact Act, through which you can ask about any Congressional bill that goes through: 'What is the educational potential here?'; and take a portion of that particular bill and devote it to educational purposes. Inadvertantly that has already happened, the energy bill, CETA of course, and others, have educational components.

One of the things the Council is concerned about is that there is very little coordination within the Government structure for all these activities. The Council doesn't think it should be tightly organized necessarily, but that people ought to talk together least when they are in one department dealing with education, they ought to be knowledgeable about what is going on in the other departments.

A fourth area we are looking at will be the international, intercultural dimensions of continuing education, not just because this happens to be a nice 'exotic' field that has some special interest to it at the present. We feel that the bilingual education, ethnic heritage and international programs under Title VI and others have tremendous relevance for each other as well as for the institutions and the population at large. There are some signs that the Administration is moving in a stronger fashion in these directions and we are very pleased to see that. We want to react with some policy recommendations in these areas.

One of our basic objectives is to raise questions, and we would like to have the inputs from people like yourselves to see whether we are raising the right questions, and whether or not in the things we are considering there is a Federal role, even if it is

not to get involved. There may be a noninvolvement approach that the Federal government ought to take with respect to some of these matters that we may want to spell out. And here again we would like to have the guidance of your thinking and your studies.

We are trying to do a number of these things in the context of past work--people don't realize that the Council is 12 years old. It was established Title I, when the Higher Education Act was established, but the mandate of the Council goes beyond the specific Title I language that gave birth to it. In brief, that is what the Council is up to.

We have some strategies and legislative recommendations being developed; and we will be in touch with the Administration and the HEW planners at the present time. Later as in the Congressional go-around late this year and next spring, we will be involved with the Congressional staff and hopefully serve as sort of an idea presenter in these various fields. We make no claim at being original or inventive or innovative in these things. We are trying to copy all the good ideas we can and put them in some form we hope will be useful not only to Congress but to the Administration as it takes a leadership stance in the field of continuing education.

Justine Rodriguez, Panel Chairperson
Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning
and Evaluation, DHEW

Thank you very much. We appreciate your coming here very much indeed, and we are preparing to take a very complete summary of the meeting, disseminating it to those of the Administration who could benefit from it. I was fascinated by the coherence of the presentations with each other and by the number of specific ideas that I found coming from so many different people. I am sure your presentations will be much appreciated.

NOTES FROM THE MEETING OF THE INTERAGENCY
PANEL FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON ADULTHOOD
JANUARY 23, 1979

The meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood was convened by Chairperson Justine Rodriguez at 9:40 a.m. A draft of the proceedings, "Postsecondary Education Reauthorization and the Adult Nontraditional Learner", from the October 31, 1978 meeting of the Panel was distributed to Panel members for their review. Further comments should be directed to Dr. Maure Hurt, Jr. at the Social Research Group. These proceedings are expected to be disseminated shortly.

The two main agenda items for the meeting were: changing socio-demographics in our country and how these changes may impact on social institutions and programs and; plans for future Panel meetings and a Panel sponsored conference to be held in late Spring.

"A Profound Transformation", a slide presentation produced by the American Association of School Administrators, graphically illustrated the changing demographics in the United States. Ellen Lamparter, Office of Education, administered the presentation for Panel members. Barbara Torrey and Douglas Norwood, Fiscal Economists, Office of Management and Budget, then presented some of their analyses of the implications of changing demographics on Federal programs, entitled "The Greying of the Federal Budget", and led a lively discussion with Panel members.

The changing values and the changing life styles of our society were cited as contributing factors to the decline in fertility rates, the decrease in the number of live births, and the increase in longevity which our nation is presently experiencing. These factors are compounded by numerous other societal influences such as liberalized abortion laws, high divorce rates and

better health care. A major point of concern raised was: to what extent will shifts in population cohorts impact on social programs, research directions, Federal budget planning and relationships between Federal, state and local governments. The object of the discussion was to sensitize the audience to the need for creative thinking and planning now.

Some points of interest were the statistics dealing with school age cohorts and the decline in fertility. In 1957 a high point was reached for the number of lifetime births per woman, 3.8. By 1976, however, the number had dropped to 1.8 lifetime births per woman. Women entering the labor market and postponing marriage and childbearing was cited as a major factor in the trend downward. It was predicted that by the year 1981 the median age of the population will be 30, and by 1990 the 55+ age cohort will be larger than the school age cohort. The discussion also touched on correlations between age and in school populations, migration patterns, housing, crime, labor force participation and credit markets.

It was difficult for the discussants to say precisely what the long range implications of a low population growth rate would be; or what the effects would be if population growth remained at the present rate for several years. They stressed, however, the need to have more issue raising sessions now in order to prepare for the future.

The Panel discussed topics and themes for future meetings and the proposed Spring conference. Mentioned were: the demographics of aging; the retirement years; continuing education; the realization of life styles; and the available resources, data bases, etc., dealing with adulthood. There was some discussion of plans for the meetings preceding the Spring conference.

A meeting of the Steering Committee of the Panel followed the conclusion of the regular meeting.

Panel members will be notified of the next meeting date.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00.

Present at the January 23, 1979 meeting of the Adulthood Panel:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>TELEPHONE</u>
Douglas Norwood	OMB	395-4576
Barbara Torrey	OMB	395-4576
Peggy Berger	SEA/CR/USDA	447-3089
Vincent Piper	HUD	755-6585
Jessie Gertman	NIA	496-9322
Lois Morrill	SRG	331-8706
Ellen Lamparter	OE	245-8176
Joyce Taylor	APS	245-0911
Dick Rowe	OE	245-9849
Bruce Craig	OE&AOA	
Stan Patterson	Community College/OE	245-9756
Ray Rackley	ACYF	755-7740
Jerry Lord	NIE	254-6271
Howard Hjelm	BOAE/OE	245-9634
Jorie Mark	DAE/OE	245-2774
Alice Scates	OE	
Manny Smith	ASPE	245-1882
Edith Grotberg	ACYF	755-7750
Maure Hurt, Jr.	SRG	331-8706
Gene Sullivan	Job Corps/DOL	

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>TELEPHONE</u>
Byron Clark	DAE/OE	
Betty Ward	OE	
Cindy Hillman	OPRE	
Justine Rodriguez	ASPE	245-1878
Hilary Gardner-Keaton	SRG	331-8706

Notes from the Meeting of the Interagency Panel
for Research and Development on Adulthood
February 28, 1979

The meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood was convened by Chairperson Justine Rodriguez at 9:45 a.m. The minutes of the Adulthood Panel meeting, held January 23, 1979, were approved as submitted.

It was announced that the Spring Conference Program Planning Committee would meet on March 12, 1979, to discuss conference particulars and review the names of resource persons submitted by Panel members.

There was discussion and subsequent formation of a Nominating Committee to submit names for Chairperson and Program Chairperson of the Panel. Gene Welden was selected to serve as the committee chairperson. The other participants will be Ray Rackley, Charles Bunting, and Bruce Craig. Panel members with suggestions should contact Ray Rackley (755-7740) or Gene Welden (245-9274 or 9866) as soon as possible. The committee will submit the suggestions at the next meeting and an election will follow.

Report from the Spring Conference Planning Committee

Jerry Lord, NIE, reported on the February 27, 1979, meeting of the conference planning committee. The issues to consider were: (1) whether cross-cutting themes would be a more effective approach for the conference; and (2) whether the roles of adults, suggested to date, were comprehensive representations or whether they should be enlarged (i.e., include the area of aging). The roles, as outlined, are: the adult as a worker, a learner, a family

member, a community member and as a healthy person. The Panel was asked to reflect on these categories and to offer suggestions for subdivisions if applicable.

Also under consideration were conference specifics: the conference time frame; the keynote speaker; the conference structure; the number of resource persons to be invited; and whether Panel members would assume an active participancy status in the conference structure. Panel members were asked to consider all these various points and offer suggestions.

Presentation on Stress and Social Support throughout the Life Course

Dr. Barry D. Lebowitz, Head, Research Programs, Center for Studies of the Mental Health of the Aging, NIMH, made a presentation to the Panel on Stress and Social Support throughout the Life Course. Dr. Lebowitz termed stress as a major area of concern at NIMH. He commented on some present day theories regarding families as well as gaps in our knowledge of support systems. Specifically, he discussed stress stemming from the family's role as a social support for the aged. Here Dr. Lebowitz made the distinction between healthy elderly persons and infirm persons. Needed research directions related to both concepts were also proposed.

Some of the most stress inducing times in the life cycle occur in conjunction with events encountered in adult life. Retirement, the "empty-nest scene", widowhood, and the death of a child or grandchild are a few of the instances in which adults experience a great deal of stress. In order to help people deal with stress, Dr. Lebowitz recounted, researchers are (1) seeking

more information on this phenomenon and (2) attempting to mobilize social supports through formal and informal methods.

Dr. Lebowitz dispelled some prevailing notions concerning families, such as: the family is "dead" as a functioning, supportive, social entity and, that great numbers of elderly are socially isolated. Both hypotheses, Dr. Lebowitz explained, are not correct. The family as a social unit or organization is functioning; though in some instances it has been redefined and termed "modified extended family". Also, the number of socially isolated elderly is not as high as one would suppose. There is a proportion of elderly who feel they have no one to contact for help, but the majority do have others to turn to, and many have their families as their key support. Despite this heartening situation, stressful situations do arise in families who are caring for an aged member. The degree to which families experience stress depends to a great extent on the physical and mental condition of the aged parent or family member. Families frequently "burn out" after prolonged periods of caring and nursing. Little is known about this phenomenon, it is an area for further research.

Dr. Lebowitz, as mentioned earlier, identified two of the most effective strategies for coping with stress: seek information and mobilize social supports. The trend recently has been to focus on informal methods of social supports. Frequently the informal and self-help methods are the most simplistic but the most effective and the more readily accepted methods. Much is still unknown, however, about the timing of supports. They often seem to be too early or too late to help those most in need. More research is needed in

the area of family relationships, specifically relationships between middle aged and older adults. Relationships between informal and formal support systems also need to be studied. Are they complementary or do they cancel each other out?

The date of April 9, 1979 was selected for the next meeting of the Adulthood Panel.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Present at the February 28, 1979 meeting of the Adulthood Panel:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Telephone</u>
Bruce Craig	AOA (OHDS/DHEW)	472-3050
Frances Hamilton	OE/BOAE	245-2653
Sue Bogner	HSA	443-1134
Vincent Piper	HUD	755-6585
Ray Rackley	ACYF	755-7740
Jorie Mark	DAE/OE	245-2774
Mike Batten	National Manpower Inst.	466-2450
Archie Lapointe	National Manpower Inst.	466-2450
Bayard Clark	DAE/BOAE/OE	245-9760
Kenneth Gardner	NIA	496-5579
Alice Y. Scates	OE	245-8380
Manny Smith	ASPE/DHEW	245-1882
Robert Stump	NIE	254-5736
James G. Allen	Community College Unit/ BHCE	245-9756
Richard F. McCarthy	NACECE	376-8888

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Telephone</u>
Shirley Brothers	OLLR/OE	472-5150
Fran Jacobs	AOA/OHDS/DHEW	245-0004
Paul Delker	OE/DHEW	245-2278
Philip E. Grossmann	APS/OHDS/DHEW	472-5872
Peggy S. Berger	SEA/CR/USDA	447-3089
J. Eugene Welden	BHCE/OE	245-9868
Jerry Lord	NIE	254-6271
Joyce Taylor	APS	245-0911
Maure Hurt, Jr.	SRG	331-8706
Hilary Gardner-Keaton	SRG	331-8706
Barry D. Lebowitz	NIMH	443-1185

OLD AGE AND FAMILY FUNCTIONING

Barry D. Lebowitz, Ph.D.*

INTRODUCTION

Interest in the family has increased tremendously among researchers, practitioners, and policy makers in the field of aging. Considerable concern has been devoted on the one hand to aging associated changes in interpersonal, marital, and sexual relationships within the marital dyad or for a surviving spouse. At the same time, family in a broad sense has been seen as a resource in coping with impairment and disability, and much effort has been devoted to the identification of the nature and extent of helping relationships. In this paper I shall not touch upon all aspects of family function in old age, but rather shall restrict the discussion to just a few issues of current concern in both the concept formation and policy arenas in viewing the family as part of a helping network.

First, however, I would like to deal with a few conceptions and misconceptions about the family. Probably the most widely held notion concerns the low level of functional utility of the family in contemporary industrial society. It seems common sense to many that geographic mobility, industrialization, the rise of specialized organizations for education, child care, and work, have all made the family a useless or

* Dr. Lebowitz is a research sociologist, Center for Studies of the Mental Health of the Aging, National Institute of Mental Health, Rockville, Maryland 20857

In Press, J. of Gerontological Social Work vol 11:2, 1979

vestigial manifestation of an earlier mode of social organization. After all, the argument goes, grandparents no longer live upstairs from their married children, large family gatherings rarely take place, and people would rather be in some nuclear family unit of one or perhaps two generations. Contemporary scholarship has shown this to be an inadequate conceptualization in at least two ways. On the one hand, historical studies have shown that the idealized characterization of family life in the past is both inadequate and inaccurate. Things were not so good in those good old days, as the historical and comparative studies in family structure are beginning to show. Second, the loss of family-based functions have only succeeded in redefining the notion of family into such notions as the "modified extended family" (Shanas and Streib, 1965). Other studies have identified the "fictive-kin" functioning of networks of friends, neighbors, and others within a person's social environment. It is therefore safe to say that notions concerning the death of the family are misplaced and of dubious validity.

The second widely held misconception flows from the first and indicates that even if families still function they do not do so for the elderly. Here the argument goes that most old people are alone, without support, and therefore both physically and socially isolated. It is indeed the case that many old people live alone -- 14% of the men over age 65 and 36% of the women over age 65 (Siegel, 1976) -- but this does not necessarily mean they are isolated. Indeed, in its study of the elderly in Cleveland, Ohio, the U.S. General Accounting Office (1977)

reports that 9/10 of their respondents received some type of service from family or friends and that 87% of their respondents indicated that they had someone to help if they became ill or disabled. I do not mean to say that since one in ten did not receive any assistance from family or friends and that since 13% could not identify a helper that isolation is not a problem. This is a large and significant number of persons who are at risk, but the numbers are not nearly as great as one might believe. Even among the 1.1 million nursing home residents the majority (61%) receives weekly visitors and another 15% receives visitors at least monthly; 11% receives no visitors at all (Zappolo, 1977). Here, too, the 11% is significant, but not nearly as large as might be expected. Thus, concerns about the widespread prevalence of social isolation among the elderly are inaccurate, and it is reasonable to assume that the family is a potential contributor to the well being of most elderly persons.

FAMILY SUPPORTS IN OLD AGE

Most old people are tied in to a network of social support within which kin -- primarily adult children and fictive kin - friends and neighbors -- provide important supportive service. Indeed, Brody (1977) has estimated that 70% to 80% of the care provided to older persons is being provided by adult children. Even among non-kin, considerable research has documented the establishment of patterns of affection of reciprocity, and of assistance among unrelated elderly persons (Morris, 1977). This has been observed in urban areas (Cantor, 1975;

Hochschild 1973; Rosow, 1967), within ethnic communities (Lopata, 1975), in rural areas (Windley, 1977), and even in the seemingly disorganized environments of single room occupancy hotels (Bohannon, 1977). Similarly, the key role of family members has been shown to be significant in many international studies (Shanas and Sussman, 1977). Current research is directed toward extending many of these analyses to other ethnic groups -- by Guttman for example, and to the complexities raised by migration -- by Litwak, E. Kahana and B. Kahana, for example. Much is known about these support systems and the importance of family within them is acknowledged. As one case in point, the elderly Cleveland respondents in the General Accounting Office (1977) study report the following sources of potential help:

<u>Source</u>	<u>% Reported</u>
Adult Children	42%
Spouse	27%
Brother or Sister	10%
Other Relative	9%
Friend	8%
All Others	4%

100% = 1400

These studies by no means exhaust the types of basic questions one would ask about the nature and operation of these networks of social support. A fundamental gap in knowledge concerns the manner

in which portions of support systems are activated in order to provide assistance to an older person. We do not have the basic understanding of the decision process whereby an older person reaches out for help or in which family members or friends offer support. Our studies have not captured the complexity of this dynamic situation. Rather, some studies tend to regard the older person as a passive recipient of needed services while others tend to regard the support system as offering limitless potential for helping. Neither is able to adequately conceptualize the dynamic processes of identification, conflict, evaluation, and decision which are characteristic of the relationship between individuals. Then, too, there is little known about the development and effects of disagreements between an older person and his or her family and friends. For example, many older persons -- estimates seem to center around 16% -- suffer from depression. Someone who is depressed is unlikely to solicit help and often is reluctant to accept it when offered. Consequently, supports may not be activated or the individual may repel those who attempt to help. The dimensions of this issue have not been systematically studied and this remains another serious gap in our knowledge.

FAMILY STRESS

At least since the classic studies of Grad and Sainsbury (1966) the notions of family stress and burden in coping with impairment have been in wide use. The Grad and Sainsbury analysis of community-based care for the mentally ill identified severe negative impact on several areas of family functioning: domestic routines, housework, shopping,

and income. They indicate that it is the elderly mentally ill who place the most severe burden on family members. It should not be surprising, therefore, that the provision of assistance within an informal support system is not without costs, or benefits. In a study of three-generation households in the U.S. (Newman, 1976) many such benefits are enumerated: affection, enjoyment, contribution to tasks such as housework or baby-sitting, and finally, relief from worry that the older person was being cared for properly. In these same households -- that is, where a parent went to live in the household of an adult child -- nearly 60% of the adult children report the parent had caused no change in the family's routines. The remainder (40%) reported such changes as reduction in social activities, loss of privacy, and in a few cases, giving up a job. About 40% reported feeling increased strain in the family -- primarily through interpersonal conflict. Nearly 90% of the adult children -- and a similar 90% of the elderly parents -- indicated satisfaction with the living arrangement, however. Significant in this study is the reported amount of care provided within the family for the elderly person who required extra care and who were unable to participate in activities:

Amount of Time Spent by child in care		
<u>(Hours/week)</u>		<u>% Reporting</u>
1-5		15%
6-15		15%
16-39		30%
40+		<u>40%</u>
	100% =	27

Despite the fact that this is a national sample, the numbers are small because by and large the elderly in three-generation households tend to be quite healthy and well functioning. Nonetheless, even if the estimate is 100% wrong -- and in only 20% of the households is more than 40 hours per week devoted to direct personal care -- we are still dealing with a major commitment of time. When this is coupled with the fact that it is the adult daughter who is usually the caregiver, then even more interesting possibilities emerge. Whatever the reason for daughters being the primary caregivers for their older parent, it is clear that the situation is likely to be changed. The increased labor force participation of women would seem to reduce the capability of devoting the necessary hours to caring for an impaired parent. The state of our knowledge is such, however, that little is known about the capacity of the family and of other supports for coping with types of impairments or disabilities, and considerable research is needed in this area. Nor is the family impact of inability to cope with disability well understood. For example, how far can the capacity of the family be stretched, and what is the impact of reaching a breaking point? There has been some work in this area (for example, Savitsky and Sharkey, 1972) and a notable recent contribution by Dobrof and Litwak (1977) highlights some of the strains, guilt, and bereavement-type reactions experienced by the families of an older person who has been institutionalized in a nursing home. Yet it is clear that we are just now beginning to identify some of those problems which underlie the new, common-sense conception that middle age

is that point in the life cycle where problems in dealing with late adolescent children are counter balanced by problems in having to deal with elderly parents.

FAMILIES AND ORGANIZATIONS . . .

Among the most exciting areas of current research and program development is the concern with the relationship of the informal networks of family and friends to the formal systems of community services. There are many manifestations of this concern, and an important conceptual base for it has been provided within the balance theory of coordination as developed by Eugene Litwak (Dobrof and Litwak, 1977). In its most basic formulation, Litwak develops the position that families or friendship groups are best able to handle the unpredictable, non-technical, diffuse tasks of living while organizations are best able to handle the predictable, technical, and specific ones. When focused upon the individual, therefore, there must be a sharing of functions and some sort of balance or congruence achieved. This notion of balance is a critical one, and is a crucial and problematic decision point in the design of social services. In the ideal, the formal organizations can be seen as a specific, technical complement to the ongoing support provided within the formal system. This conception forms the basis for the newest thinking in the design of social services, the balanced service system (Melville, 1977). In practice, however, this balance between formal and informal is rarely achieved. An important area for research is in dealing with the two polar conditions. The first is where formal services replace what was formerly

provided by the family. For example, is the likelihood of an individual's preparing a meal for an elderly parent conditioned by the availability of community nutrition services? On the other hand, if individuals try to do too much and do not avail themselves of benefits to which they are entitled, does this produce a premature "burn-out" and an inappropriate use of services? These are empirical questions concerning which relatively little is known.

The actual link between the formal and informal structures is another area in which considerably more information is required. Much has been made of the role of the gatekeepers: grocers, barbers, postal workers, bartenders, and others. Little systematic knowledge is available about who these people are, what they do and how they do it. Many case reports, along with the classic research on communication, indicate that there are those who screen information, transmit it to others, and perform valuable referral functions in the community. Solid information is needed on the dimensions of this situation and effective modes for supporting these activities must be developed.

Research is also needed on approaches to coordinating the efforts of a well functioning informal system of screening and referral with the formal support system. Though it goes beyond the scope of this paper, it is at this point that a discussion of case management, legal advocacy, ombudsman services, and other linkage and activating mechanisms, would be appropriate for a complete characterization of the relationships between families and formal organizations.

FAMILY INCENTIVES

It is clear that natural helping systems, primarily family members, are important resources for older persons. Within these systems a considerable amount of direct assistance is provided and a considerable number of linking and monitoring functions are carried out. The state of our knowledge is such that many questions remain about the how's and why's of these functions. Nonetheless, we know they are carried out and we know about some of the associated problems.

For example, both Sussman (1976, 1977) and Morris (1977) have written eloquently for the need to provide incentives to families to take major responsibility for the care of the impaired or disabled. These incentives could be cash subsidies or tax deductions for remodeling projects, cash subsidies for work lost, respite services to provide rest and recovery time for the providers of care. It is clear that well controlled and evaluated demonstration projects could be carried out in this area, and the time seems to be appropriate for such activities.

Additionally, the family is increasingly being seen as the focus for treatment in clinical or social services for the elderly (Blazer, 1978; Dobrof and Litwak, 1977). This, too, is an important developing area for research, for there are many risks which accompany often well-meaning service efforts. Indeed, care must be taken to tailor the intervention in such a way that it does not destroy the very spontaneity and creativity which made the informal system effective in the first place. This is an especially critical issue in dealing with self-help groups, many of which were developed in opposition to formally structured services

and professionalized care (Lieberman and Borman, 1976). Much remains to be learned in this area, for there is every indication that such groups and other sources of informal support will be taking an increasingly important role in providing assistance to the elderly.

The family, along with other components of the informal support system, is increasingly moving to the center of our national policy deliberations over services and entitlements of the elderly. Research must anticipate some of the concerns in this area and must provide a solid base of knowledge in this area. Methods for the identification, construction, assistance, and encouragement of informal support must be developed and the appropriate relationships between formal and informal assistance must be fostered. These are important challenges for all of us; an encouraging beginning has been made in the field, and an important period of development is ahead.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blazer, D. Working with the elderly patient's family. *Geriatrics*, 1978, 33, 117-118, 123.

Bohannon, P. (with Gorman, A.) A room of my own. Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, La Jolla, 1977.

Brody, E. Health and its social implications. In M. Marvis (Ed.), *Le vieillissement: un defi a la science et a la politique sociale*. Institut de la Vie, Paris, 1977.

Cantor, M. Life space and the social support system. *Gerontologist*, 1975, 15, 23-27.

Dobrof, R. & Litwak, E. Maintenance of family ties of long term care patients: theory and guide to practice. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1977.

Grad, J. & Sainsbury, P. Evaluating the community psychiatric service in Chichester: results. *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 1966, 44 Part 2, 246-278.

Hochschild, A. The unexpected community. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1973.

Lieberman, M. & Borman, L. (Eds.). Special issue: self help groups. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1976, 12, 261-463.

Lopata, H. Support systems of elderly urbanites. *Gerontologist*, 1975, 15, 35-41.

Melville, C. (Ed.) The balanced service system: an approach to the delivery of mental health services. Georgia Mental Health Institute, Atlanta, 1977.

Morris, R. Family responsibility - implications of recent demographic and service trends for a natural helping system. Paper presented at Gerontological Society Annual Meeting, San Francisco, 1977.

Newman, S. Housing adjustments of older people: a report of findings from the second phase. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1976.

Rosow, I. Social integration of the aged. Free Press, New York, 1967.

Savitsky, E. & Sharkey, H. The geriatric patient and his family: study of family interaction in the aged. *Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 1972, 5, 3-19.

Shanas, E. & Streib, G. Social structure and the family: generational relations. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1965.

Shanas, E. & Sussman, M. (Eds.). Family, bureaucracy, and the elderly. Duke University Press, Durham, 1977.

Siegel, J. Demographic aspects of aging and the older population in the limited states. Current Population Reports; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Special Studies: Series P-23; no. 59, 1976.

Sussman, M. The family life of old people. In R. Binstock & E. Shanas (Eds.). Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 1976, ch. 9.

United States General Accounting Office. The well being of older people in Cleveland, Ohio. Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. Washington, D.C., 1977.

Windley, P. Environmental intervention: case studies in independent living among the rural elderly. Gerontological Society Summer Research Fellowship Program, Washington, 1977.

Zappolo, A. Characteristics, social contacts, and activities of nursing home residents, United States, 1973-74 National Nursing Home Survey. National Health Survey; U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Series 13; no. 27, 1977.

Notes from the Meeting of the Interagency Panel
for Research and Development on Adulthood
April 9, 1979

The meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood was convened by Chairperson Justine Rodriguez at 9:46 a.m. The minutes of the Adulthood Panel meeting, held February 28th, were approved pending attachment of a descriptive paper by Dr. Barry Lebowitz entitled: Old Age and Family Functioning.

Report of the Nominating Committee:

At the last meeting of the Panel, a Nominating Committee was formed at the request of outgoing Chairperson Rodriguez. The Committee was charged with the task of submitting nominations for the position of Chairperson.

Ray Rackley, ACYF, speaking for the Committee, submitted the name of Jerome Lord for the position of Chairperson. Following a brief discussion the Panel unanimously approved his nomination.

The Nomination Committee had also been asked to submit nominations for the position of Program Chairperson. The Committee requested the Panel consider a more viable construct, that of a Steering Committee to coordinate Panel meeting programs, rather than elect a single individual. Panel members seconded this suggestion and Chairperson Rodriguez asked that the Committee draw up a list of suggestions of Panel members who might participate on this committee.

Agency Presentations:

In an effort to provide cross-agency perspectives of research and development on adulthood, the Panel initiated a series of brief presentations by Panel members on their agency's mandate and major present and planned R&D activities. Speaking for the Center for Studies of the Mental Health of the Aging/NIMH was Dr. Barry Lebowitz; Dr. Harry Posman spoke for the Administration on Aging; and Dr. Chuck Bunting and Ms. Carol Stoel discussed these issues with respect to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

Dr. Lebowitz provided the Panel with a summarized version of his remarks which is attached to these minutes and stands as the synopsis of his presentation.

Dr. Harry Posman, Administration on Aging, described and discussed his agency's mandate and major research and development activities. As its name implies, the Administration on Aging's (AOA) concern centers on the older and aging population in our society. He constructed, for the Panel, the framework within which AOA operates and briefly outlined the Office of Research, Demonstrations and Evaluation, which is divided into two sections: research and evaluation, and demonstrations.

The research and evaluation division administers one major program and several smaller programs. One of these is a small grants program which awards some 25 small grants annually to researchers in "low visibility" institutions. A second program deals with doctoral dissertation grants. Evaluation is limited

to 1% of the total appropriations but annual expenditures are considerably less than that. There are a large number of demonstrations projects, many of which focus on community-based services to the older and aging population.

AOA's research strategy is derived from statutory provisions and the mission of the agency. The mandate is large and broad, which allows AOA to cover a wide range of issues related to the well being of the older and aging citizen. For instance, issues relating to employment opportunities, discriminatory age practices, and suitable housing are a few of AOA's concerns.

Dr. Posman described AOA's mission as a "two-tiered approach", with emphasis on advocacy and services. The first tier of this approach, advocacy, calls for the utilization of existing public and private resources to improve present support systems. AOA also examines issues that pertain to the impact of policies and programs in the areas of employment, retirement, income, housing, health and services. On the second tier, that of services, AOA's purpose is to develop more coordinated formal and informal services for the elderly, with the primary objective being the maintenance of older persons in their own homes.

Dr. Posman also noted that AOA is presently developing a multi-year research, demonstrations and evaluation plan. Their objective is to establish a more coordinated effort between these activities. AOA's research guidelines are expected to be published sometime in May of this year.

Dr. Chuck Bunting and Ms. Carol Stoel provided the Pnael with background information on the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education as well as defined the agency's research activities.

The Fund was established in 1972 with an extremely broad mandate, that of "the improvement of postsecondary education". Postsecondary education, Dr. Bunting defined as "all forms of largely organized learning and learning related services beyond the high school level. Most of the Fund's applicants (90%) and grantees (70-80%) are from colleges and universities. The Fund operates as a small foundation consisting of a small staff and a board of advisors.

The Fund works strictly as a grant program which looks for mostly action-oriented projects. This criterion extends to research and development projects in the sense that they too must have impacts in the near term. The major focus is learner centered improvements. The Fund looks for the links between the funded programs/projects and improvements in services for the targeted learner populations. Dr. Bunting commented on the fact that most of the awards have served the educational needs of the older than traditional age college student. The reason for this phenomenon has not really been investigated.

In summation, Dr. Bunting stated that most Fund support goes to comprehensive, practically oriented programs that present a new and fresh approach to the topic under consideration. The Fund has also extended their focus to include dissemination and diffusion in an effort to improve the visibility of the possible range of services.

Ms. Carol Stoel emphasized the Fund's interest in identifying the factors that bring adults back into academia. She commented on the fact that knowledge gaps exist with respect to adult needs in the areas of education and career changes and the links, if they exist, between these two constructs. Presently four programs are in progress which deal with the following questions: (1) when do adults return to school; (2) what are adults looking for when they return to school and (3) what will make programs more responsive to the needs of adults.

Report of the Conference Planning Committee:

Chairperson Rodriguez led the discussion in the absence of Jerome Lord. She noted that at the last conference planning committee meeting, it was decided each of the five specific subtheme groups would have a chairperson to coordinate the groups' activities. Ray Rackley, chair of the group: Adult as a Family Member, suggested inviting Irving Lazar as a resource person. He noted that Dr. Lazar is presently involved in developing a family policy statement which would be relevant to the discussion. Jorie Mark, chair of the group: Adult as a Community Member, suggested Terry Sanford as a possible resource person due to his interest in adults and their relationship to a youth-oriented society. The group: Adult as a Healthy Person, will be chaired by Juel Janis. Chuck Bunting will chair the group: Adult as a Learner, and Howard Hjelm will chair the final group: Adult as a Worker. Panel members are invited to contact these chairpersons with their suggestions and/or ideas concerning other possible resource persons.

Final Note:

Dr. Chuck Bunting expressed his gratitude to Justine Farr Rodriguez for the outstanding job she has done as Chairperson of the Adulthood Panel. He spoke for all Panel members when he thanked her for her unswerving dedication to the goals of the Panel and for her guidance and leadership during her two years as Chairperson.

The Adulthood Panel meeting concluded at 11:45 a.m.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING OF THE ADULTHOOD PANEL MEETING, APRIL 9, 1979:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>TELEPHONE</u>
Joyce E. Taylor	DHEW/OHDS/APS	245-9202
Jorie Mark	DHEW/USOE/DAE	245-2774
Nickie A. Athanason-Dymensky	DHEW/USOE/BOAE	245-3352
W. Ray Rackley	ACYF	755-7740
Chuck Bunting	DHEW/Fund	245-8099
Peggy Berger	SEA/CR/USDA	447-3089
Bayard Clark	DHEW/USOE/DAE	245-2774
Mary V. Marks	DHEW/USOE/BOAE/DRD	245-2653
Lita Colligan	DHEW/OHDS/RSH	472-4252
Harry Posman	DHEW/OHDS/AOA	245-0004
Barry Lebowitz	NIMH	443-1185
Carol Stoel	DHEW/Fund	245-8091
Justine Rodriguez	DHEW/ASPE	245-1878
Maure Hurt	SRG	331-8706
Faye Baumgarner	SRG	331-8706
Hilary Gardner-Keaton	SRG	331-8706
Manny Smith	DHEW/ASPE	245-1882

RESEARCH IN MENTAL HEALTH AND AGING

Barry D. Lebowitz, Ph.D.
Head, Research Program
Center for Studies of the Mental Health of the Aging
National Institute of Mental Health

INTRODUCTION

This has been an exciting time in the field of mental health in general and in aging in particular. The past 18 months have seen the publication of 3 major, nationally-focused reports. The first, in December 1977, was the report on the age discrimination issued by the U. S. Civil Rights Commission. In this report, the Commission singles out the mental health service system for systematically discriminating against the aged with mental health problems. Second was the report of the HEW Secretary's Committee on Mental Health and Illness of the Elderly. This Congressionally-mandated Committee was the first to systematically address the full range of research, training, service, and prevention problems and prospects, and it issued several significant recommendations in each of these areas. It should be especially noted that minority concerns were singled out in this report. The third report, that of the President's Commission on Mental Health, brought the problems confronting the underserved, unserved, and inappropriately served to the forefront of national concern. The young, the old, the minority, and the chronic mentally ill comprised the full focus of this Commission's report. The President's Commission has already had a significant impact through its substantive focus and budgetary assistance, and will continue to influence through proposed legislation and reorganization of the National Institute of Mental Health.

Over the years the mental health field has not been particularly responsive to the needs and problems of the elderly. This knowledge base has not been strong and the commitment to service and training has been very low. This is especially disquieting when we acknowledge the high rates of psychiatric impairment in the aged, the disproportionate suicide problem, and the many stresses and dislocations which the elderly confront. All of these are exacerbated with the great projected growth of the most vulnerable of the aged--those over the age of 75.

Though early in the process, this state of affairs has been radically changed in the past two years, and prospects are very bright indeed. In the past two years the Institute's research with a primary focus on aging has doubled from \$2.5 million to \$5.0 million, and this growth is expected to continue. This is for research where the aged are the primary focus; we estimate a roughly equivalent amount of research supported where the aged form a minor or secondary focus. In training, the number of specialty training programs in geriatric psychiatry went from 1 to 6 in one year, and we expect this to increase as well. These early signs are favorable, and support and recognitions for the program is developing very well. The Center for Studies of the Mental Health of the Aging is the Institute's focal point for aging, and the areas of support in the Center's program are presented in the next section.

GENERAL RESEARCH AREAS

The Center for Studies of the Mental Health of the Aging is the focal point in NIMH for aging. The major role of the Center is to stimulate, coordinate, and support research, training, and technical assistance efforts relating to aging and mental health.

The Center supports those studies which have a primary focus on the mental health and illness implications of the aging process and of old age. It supports a wide-ranging, multidisciplinary set of studies which have both theoretical and policy or applied implications. These include:

1. Mental Health of the Aging and Etiology, Diagnosis, Course, and Prevention of Mental Disorders in Later Life: (a) studies of the psychological, social, and biomedical factors (and their interplay) that affect mental health and mental illness in later life; (b) clinical and diagnostic studies of the nature and types of mental disorders in later life; (c) studies to assess and measure the extent of cognitive, affective, and social function impairment in later life; (d) studies of the onset, course, and natural history of mental illness in later life; and (e) studies of developmental life crises, stress, adaptation, and morale in later life with special attention to the prevention of mental disorders.
2. Treatment and Delivery of Mental Health Services:
(a) treating mental disorders in later life; (b) coordinating mental health and other services to the aging in the broader health and community services systems; (c) providing services to special populations; (d) structuring of services; and (e) researching new and more effective services.
3. Program Development, Social Policy, and Social Problems
Research in Mental Health and Aging: (a) institutional program development and alternatives to institutionalization; (b) formal

and informal community support systems; (c) financing/reimbursement mechanisms; (d) policy and legal or administrative dimensions in technical assistance and program design; (e) models for research utilization; and (f) models of technical assistance for research development.

In addition, the Center supports grants in the areas of research training and clinical or services training. Further information on these programs will be provided upon request.

PRIORITY RESEARCH CONCERNS

Though the Center supports a broad range of research, and encourages researchers to use their ingenuity and innovativeness to develop research proposals, the following are issues which have been identified as particularly significant and worthy of attention. These are listed in 4 general areas: mental disorders, treatment assessment, service delivery, and social problems / social policy/prevention.

MENTAL DISORDERS

1. Epidemiology Estimates of the incidence and prevalence of major mental disorders all increase with age, but these estimates are based on a patchwork of non-comparable studies. The absence of solid epidemiological data continues to be a major hindrance to the effective planning of appropriate mental health services for the elderly. The Center cooperates with the Center for Epidemiological Studies/NIMH in the support of these projects.

2. Senile dementia and other organic brain syndromes Alzheimer's Disease/senile dementia is a major public health problem. The etiology of the disorder is unknown though there are promising leads in several areas: slow virus, genetic factors, automimmune responses, aluminum concentration, and in the neurotransmitters. Considerable research is needed in etiology, clinical course, differential assessment and diagnosis. The present state of the science provides little to the clinician in the differentiation of acute from chronic states, in the recognition of pseudodementia, and in the selection of appropriate treatment approaches.
3. Depression Depression in the aged is well known and acknowledged to affect some 20 percent of those over 65. Basic research in the biochemistry of depression along with social and behavioral studies have opened promising areas for further research.
4. Basic neuroscience Basic research in the neurosciences is necessary to uncover processes of development/deterioration so necessary in understanding mental disorders in old age.
5. Basic research in cognition Basic research in cognitive and intellectual function is necessary so as to distinguish normal change from impairments associated with mental disorders in old age. Promising developments in memory structure and function and in intellectual functioning have already been uncovered.

TREATMENT ASSESSMENT

1. Psychopharmacology Research with aged subjects is needed in the many areas of psychopharmacology, including pharmacodynamics, pharmacokinetics, dose level determination, and drug-drug interactions. Significant developments can be anticipated in this area because instrumentation and protocol development have been completed in research on other age groups. These techniques have not been applied to the elderly (with significant exceptions) and therefore valid findings can be anticipated in an unusually short period. The Center cooperates with the Psychopharmacology Research Branch, NIMH, in the support of these projects.
2. Psychotherapy and other forms of treatment Solid research on the effectiveness of a wide variety of therapies: psychotherapy, behavior therapy, milieu therapy, each with and without drugs, has not been carried out on the elderly with mental health problems. Though the outcome measures are weak - and need considerable development - nonetheless, well-controlled, double-blind studies of therapeutic effectiveness must be carried out for the elderly.

SERVICE DELIVERY

1. Services research Services research including evaluation of innovative services must be carried out in the attempt to develop services responsive and sensitive to the needs of older persons with

mental health problems. Such research has begun to illuminate the many barriers - financial, attitudinal, availability, and accessibility - to the effective provision of these services and appropriate utilization by the elderly. Other promising avenues of research have begun exploring the complex interdependencies of formal services and informal or natural supports such as family, friends, neighbors, and neighborhood merchants. These studies should be expanded and the special problems of the rural and the minority should be addressed.

2. Service systems coordination The collaboration of mental health, health, and social services is a major policy initiative in DHEW. The payoff for this will be especially great for the elderly, many of whom suffer from a variety of problems. Research in inter-organizational relations around such areas as conflict, collaboration and coordination will provide important guidance for the development of multidisciplinary, multi-problem service systems. This research area is new, and many significant and potentially fruitful issues must be explored.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS/SOCIAL POLICY/PREVENTION

1. Family and social support Research in this area has been powerful and significant in the uncovering of the full nature of informal support provided to the elderly. Family is the core of the system, but for those without families, support is provided by friends, neighbors, and many others. Much remains unanswered in this area, in issues such as the amount of burden that can be supported (e.g. in depression and dementia), how support is mobilized

and sustained, stress and other impacts of providing support, and the effects of burnout of support providers. Such research must be carried out so as to maintain natural supports as key agents in prevention, treatment, and service delivery.

2. Life stress and crisis This area is a broad one, and the mental health research literature in it varies from substantial and useful ones in retirement and residential relocation to weaker knowledge bases in death of spouse, chronic physical conditions, "empty nest", to almost nothing in such areas as mental health impact of death of a child or grandchild. These strands of research must be continued, systematized, and compiled so as to provide guidance for the development of prevention and intervention programs.
3. Policy Research in social policy in aging mental health has been rare in the past, but this research must be encouraged in such areas as financing of mental health services under different third-party reimbursement mechanisms, deinstitutionalization, long-term care, legal issues (e.g. protective services, and civil commitment), and in policy implementation areas such as Federal/State/local relations.
4. Social problems The well-established relationship between economic issues (e.g. recession and inflation) and mental health has only recently been suggested to be especially strong for the elderly. This line of research should be strengthened and expanded. Other social issues such as the fear of criminal victimization (above and beyond the actual fact of victimization), and neighborhood

change or renewal have also been shown to be related to the mental health of the elderly. These lines of inquiry should be extended and coordinated so as to provide a solid perspective on the human impact of social problems.

CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

1. Long-term care Approximately 80 percent of the elderly residents of long-term care facilities suffer from some form of mental impairment. The full range of research issues and areas developed in the previous sections must be applied and explored in this setting.
2. Deinstitutionalization The older persons who formerly resided in State mental hospitals and have been released to the community must form the focus of research in all areas described in previous sections. Of special importance in this area would be research into the biomedical, social, and behavioral factors related to reinstitutionalization or relocation to a more restrictive setting.
3. Minority elderly Almost no research has been done in the mental health and mental illness issues for the aged members of minority groups. Consequently, a full-scale approach to these issues must be developed so that the many gaps in our knowledge base and approaches to prevention, treatment, and services can be developed.
4. Rural elderly The unique situation of the rural elderly has not been adequately explored and this remains a serious gap in our knowledge base. A concerted effort toward developing a wide ranging program of research in the mental health and mental illness of the rural elderly must be initiated.

PROCEDURES

The Center staff provide technical assistance through consultation for the development and stimulation of research and training applications focused on the mental health of aging persons. Researchers and directors of training programs are encouraged to contact the Center for discussion of ideas for new research or training projects. Concept papers, preliminary proposals, and later drafts can be submitted for staff review and comment prior to formal submission of the proposal. Many investigators find this to be a useful approach to the development of proposals and we encourage you to take advantage of this service - if you wish. On the other hand, staff consultation is not required, and investigators can choose to submit a proposal without it.

In either case, applications are accepted 3 times during the year: March 1, July 1, and November 1. Applications should be submitted on the standard Public Health Service application kit for research (NIH-398), which is available at all universities and hospitals as well as from the Division of Research Grants/NIH/Bethesda, Maryland. Proposals are reviewed for technical merit by a peer review panel; the recommendations of this panel are transmitted to the National Advisory Mental Health Council for policy review. Approved applications are then referred to the Center for funding. The review cycle lasts approximately 9 months, but, under the Freedom of Information Act, investigators can obtain the results of the initial review as soon as they are available (usually between 3 and 4 months).

CONCLUSION

In summary, the prospects for significant work in aging mental health have never been better. Public concern is great, administration support seems solid, and the beginnings of a substantial program have been established. The staff members of the Center for Studies of the Mental Health of the Aging are anxious to provide whatever consultation and assistance we can to help the field develop and grow. The challenge to all of us is exhilarating and exciting.

CENTER FOR STUDIES OF THE MENTAL HEALTH OF THE AGING
Division of Special Mental Health Programs
National Institute of Mental Health
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 18-95
Rockville, Maryland 20857
Chief: Gene D. Cohen, M.D.
Telephone: (301)443-1185

PUBLICATIONS*

The Aged and Community Mental Health: A Guide to Program Development.
New York City: Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, 1971.

Goldfarb, Alvin I.; Dobrof, Rose, ed. Aged Patients in Long-Term Care Facilities, A Staff Manual. DHEW Publication No. (ADM)76-154. 1973.
GPO Stock No. 017-024-00321-2, \$1.50.

Aging and Mental Health. Interview with Dr. Thomas Anderson. Transcript
of community service radio program. DHEW Publication No. (ADM)77-459.
1977. GPO Stock No. 017-024-00613-1, \$.80.

Birren, James E.; Butler, Robert N.; Greenhouse, Samuel W.; Sokoloff,
Louis; and Yarrow, Marian R., eds. Human Aging I, A Biological and
Behavioral Study. DHEW Publication No. (ADM)77-122. 1971. GPO Stock No.
017-024-00693-9, \$5.00. (Available only at GPO.)

Granick, Samuel, and Patterson, Robert D., eds. Human Aging II, An
Eleven-Year Followup Biomedical and Behavioral Study. DHEW Publication
No. (ADM)77-123. 1971. GPO Stock No. 017-024-00695-5, \$3.25. (Available
only at GPO.)

Dobrof, Rose, and Litwak, Eugene. Maintenance of Family Ties of Long-
term Care Patients: Theory and Guide to Practice. DHEW Publication No.
(ADM) 77-400. 1977. GPO Stock No. 017-024-00637-8, \$2.75.

Steury, Steven, and Blank, Marie L., eds. Readings in Psychotherapy with
Older People. DHEW Publication No. (ADM)77-409. 1977. GPO Stock No. 017-
024-00773-1, \$4.25.

Blank, Marie L. Research on the Mental Health of the Aging, 1960-1976.
DHEW Publication No. (ADM)77-379. 1977. GPO Stock No. 017-024-00624-6,
\$2.20.

* A courtesy copy of publications and reprints is available upon
request from the Center. Where GPO stock number and price are indicated,
additional copies can be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents,
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. (Certain pub-
lications are out of stock at the Center and are available only at GPO.)

Brody, Elaine M., et al. A Social Work Guide for Long-Term Care Facilities. DHEW Publication No. (ADM)76-177. 1976. GPO Stock No. 017-024-00323-9, \$2.20.

REPRINTS

Blank, Marie L. Recent research findings on practice with the aging. Social Casework, pp. 382-389, June 1971.

Blank, Marie L. Raising the age barrier to psychotherapy. Geriatrics, Vol. 29, pp. 141-148, November 1974.

Blank, Marie L. Meeting the needs of the aged: The social worker in the community health center. Public Health Reports, Vol. 92, No. 1, pp. 39-42, January-February 1977.

Cohen, Gene D. Mental health services and the elderly: Needs and options. American Psychiatric Association, 133:1, pp. 65-68, January 1976.

Cohen, Gene D. Approach to the geriatric patient. Medical Clinics of North America, Vol. 61, No. 4, pp. 855-866, July 1977.

Granick, Samuel, and Patterson, Robert D. Summary and conclusions. In: Granick, Samuel, and Patterson, Robert D., eds. Human Aging II: An Eleven-Year Followup Biomedical and Behavioral Study. DHEW Publication No. (ADM)77-123. 1971.

Hilbert, Nancy M.; Niederehe, George; and Kahn, Robert L. Accuracy and speed of memory in depressed and organic aged. Education Gerontology: An International Quarterly, 1:131-146, 1976.

Kahn, Robert L., and Miller, Nancy E. Assessment of altered brain function in the aged. In: Siegler, I.; Storandt, M.; and Elias, M., eds. Clinical Psychology in Gerontology. New York: Plenum Press, 1978.

Kahn, Robert L.; Zarit, Steven H.; Hilbert, Nancy M.; and Niederehe, George. Memory complaint and impairment in the aged. Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 32, pp. 1569-1573, December 1975.

Lebowitz, Barry D. Criminal victimization of the elderly. Statement before the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Scientific Planning, Analysis, and Cooperation, Committee on Science and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., January 31, 1978.

Patterson, Robert D. Grief and depression in old people. Maryland State Medical Journal, Vol. 18, pp. 75-79, September 1969.

Sheldon, Alan; McEwan, Peter J.M.; and Ryser, Carol Pierson. Conclusions and implications. (Final chapter from Retirement Patterns and Predictions. DHEW Publication No. (ADM)74-49, 1975.)

Symposium on Age Differentiation in Depressive Illness. Presentations made at the 25th Annual Scientific Meeting of Gerontological Society (1972). Journal of Gerontology, Vol. 31, No. 3: 278-326, 1976.

Zarit, Steven H.; Miller, Nancy E.; and Kahn, Robert L. Brain function, intellectual impairment, and education in the aged. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, Vol. XXVI, No. 2, pp. 58-67, 1978.

December 1978

APPENDIX

Notes from the Meeting of
The Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adults
May 10, 1977

The meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adults was chaired by Dr. Lois-ellin Datta, NIE. Dr. Datta called for reports from three subcommittees which were appointed at the March Panel meeting:

- Sponsorship. The committee reported on their search for a potential sponsor. While there are approximately twenty interested agencies, and several possibilities for a sponsor (including the Departments of Labor, Commerce, the Office of Human Development, and Division of Education, or a consortium), dollar support from a lead agency is still open. It was understood that integration of Federally-funded research projects on adults into IRIS will await such funding. It was suggested that interested agencies sponsor individual meetings during this period of development
- Program. It was recommended that regular meetings continue for the exchange of information on such topics as adult development (to include the family, health, and aging); job restructuring (and "the quality of life"); and lifelong learning. Several speakers were suggested for future meetings. Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, known for his writing in education, society, and aging, from the University of Chicago, will address the Panel on June 13th at 2:30 p.m., Marvin Center. The meeting will be sponsored by NIE.
- Nominating. At the recommendation of the nominating committee, Justine Rodriguez, OASPE, was elected to the chairmanship of the Adult Panel

for the period of a year. In accepting the chairmanship, Ms. Rodrigues stated that it could be relinquished at the request of a sponsoring agency.

The major item on the agenda was a presentation by Dr. Fred Best, from the Quality of Life Research Associates, and Dr. Barry Stern, an Education Policy Analyst in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, DHEW.

Drs. Stern and Best described their research on education, work and leisure over the total life span and problems associated with the "linear life plan" (straight progression from the beginning of work to retirement). Trends in this linear pattern indicate that the time spent in work activities has been increasingly compressed into mid-life, and non-work time has increased substantially in the earlier and later years of life for the average U.S. male. The most likely alternative to current linear life-time patterns is a more "cyclic life plan," where, basically, time spent on education and retirement is redistributed to mid-life in the form of periods of leisure or education. They pointed to the continuing problem of shortage of jobs, the brunt of which has been borne disproportionately by minority groups, women, youth, and older people. They suggested that work sharing, in the form of cyclic life patterns, be considered as a further alternative for coping with the job shortage problem. Such an approach could be structured to deal with a number of social problems simultaneously, particularly adequate access to leisure and education throughout life, and the need to ease the traditional progression from school to work to retirement. They concluded that achieving the goal of making work more accessible, while making education and leisure more attainable as well, merits high priority on the nation's policy research agenda. Their study, "Lifetime Distribution

"Distribution of Education, Work and Leisure," is available for \$1.00 from the Institute for Educational Leadership; Suite 310, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Dr. Nancy Tapper, who is joining the Center for Policy Process as Vice-President for Research, invited Panel members to participate in a follow-up to the recent "Life Cycle Planning Conference." Formerly president of Peralta Community College for Non-Traditional Studies, she offered to speak to the Panel at a future meeting regarding non-traditional education from a practitioner's point of view.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45.

Present at the Adult Panel meeting of May 10, 1977:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Telephone</u>
Mary Higgins	CSRS/USDA	447-6435
Helen Somerville	SRG	331-8706
Joseph H. Autry, M.D.	NIMH/ADAMHA/DHEW	443-4527
Barbara A. Chandler	OE/BOAE/DAE	245-2948
Edith H. Grotberg	OCD	755-7750
Pat Bryant	NIDR/NIH	496-7491
Faye Baumgarner	SRG	331-8706
Sharon Mangus	SRG	331-8706
Lois Morrill	SRG	331-8706
Hal Wallach	Census Bureau	763-2588
Bill Daniels	HEW/ASPE	245-2240

Laurence Fisher	NDP/NINCDS/NIH	496-1432
J. Eugene Welden	OE/BHCE	245-9868
Bill Renahan	OHD	245-3176
Jorie Mark	OE/BOAE/DAE	245-9751
Nancy Tapper	Center for Policy Process	387-5700
Alice Scates	OE/OPBE	245-8380
Ray Rackley	OCD	755-7440
Al Duncker	AOA	245-1268
Lois-ellin Datta	NIE	254-5310
Justine Rodriguez	ASPE/HEW	245-1878
S. Macpherson Pemberton	OE	245-2788
Ruth Siegel	NSF/BNS	632-5714
J. D. Clemmens	OS/ASPE	245-7517
Norman D. Kurland	HEW	275-1571
Barry Stern	HEW/ASE	245-8003
Fred Best	Quality of Life Research Associates	965-9887
Larry Haber	OMB	395-6132

Notes from the Meeting of
The Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adults
June 13, 1977

The meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adults was brought to order by Chairperson Justine Rodriguez at 2:40 P.M. The minutes of the May 10, 1977, meeting of the Panel were approved as distributed. An announcement was made that there would be a meeting of the Program Committee later in the week.

Dr. Jerry L. Fletcher, Senior Policy Analyst in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education/HEW, presented the Panel with a summary of a proposed study on "The Limits of Human Educability".

The prospectus cited that current knowledge suggests that further exploration on the outer limits of human educability is warranted. Concern was expressed over the need to legitimize this movement as an area worthy of further study. A primary goal would be to gather support from the Federal Government, in the hopes of establishing this field as an important area for future research. Emphasis was also placed on the need to establish a strong link with practitioners (i.e., school districts, among others), who are integrally involved in the education process.

More specifically, the prospectus called for the commissioning of a series of papers, followed by a conference and ultimately a book which would incorporate all parts of the study. Dr. Fletcher invited all interested parties to contact him for further information (245-8266).

The main item on the agenda was a presentation by Dr. Robert Havighurst, Professor in the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Human Development at the University of Chicago. Dr. Havighurst provided the Panel with an overview of the status of research on adult development in terms of what is known, what kinds of research are being done, and what might be done in the future.

Outlined for the Panel in terms of what is known today were three aspects of adult growth and development. These were defined as the personal and cognitive development of the individual, the social roles of adults, and the biological process of aging.

Throughout the recognized age periods of adulthood, individuals are confronted with what have been termed developmental tasks. Successful completion of these tasks of each period encourage healthy attitudes toward aging.

It was noted that the transitional periods in one's adult life are frequently more easily traversed due to the interaction of activities, namely, work and/or career, leisure and education.

Focusing on adult education, it was mentioned that the nature of learning in adulthood is quite involved. Some adults turning to education in their later years do so in order to improve their job performance. Others return to the academic world purely for self-expression and/or self-fulfillment.

Three theories addressed to post-retirement activities were noted. There are those individuals who, upon retirement, disengage from pre-retirement societal bonds. Known as the Disengagement Theory, this is the first of three theories of development after the age of 40-50. The Activity Theory and the Exchange Theory were also mentioned with respect to an individual's approach to life after retirement. The Activity Theory explains those

individuals who maintain the active and substantive roles of middle adulthood upon retirement. The Exchange Theory refers to those individuals who exchange power accumulated during middle adulthood in order to maintain active roles during the post-retirement period.

To date a number of studies have been undertaken to further define and analyze adult growth and development. In the area of cross-cultural studies, some researchers have focused on social classification. Others have approached adult development from an ethnic perspective. Also noted were more systematic cross-national, cross-city studies at the age of retirement.

A number of longitudinal studies were cited. They are viewed as one method of studying an individual's approach to adulthood. Attention, however, was drawn to the fact that long-range studies are more difficult to conduct and see through to the end.

There were a number of suggestions about future areas of research. Studies that focused on longevity might include the effects of slowing the physiological speed of aging, disease control and age distribution. A second point raised dealt with the effects of the rise in the cost of energy. What bearing would this have on adult growth and development? Also mentioned were the effects of a retirement policy, and interest was expressed over the possibility of pre-retirement preparation.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 P.M.

Present at the Adult Panel meeting of June 13, 1977:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Telephone</u>
Barry Stern	HEW/ASE	245-8003
Aeolian M. Jackson	HEW/OCD/R&E	755-7758
Maure Hurt	SRG	331-8706
Jeanne M. Sclater	HEW/OE/BHCE	245-9868
Edith H. Grotberg	HEW/OCD	755-7750

101

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Telephone</u>
Justine Rodriguez	HEW/ASPE	245-1878
Ray Rackley	HEW/OC	755-7740
Dick Titus	DOJ/LEAA/NILECJ	376-3994
Sandee Levine	SRG	331-8706
S. Macpherson Pemberton	HEW/OE	245-2788
Dan Bakinowski	HEW/OE	472-4879
Robert Calvert	National Center for Education Statistics	245-8340
Ruth Siegel	NSF/BNS	632-5714
Hilary Gardner	SRG	331-8706
Harry Lieberman	DOL/ETA	376-6686
Betsy Guthrie	HEW/ASPE	245-1887
Cheryl Opacinch	HEW/ASPE	245-1886
Jorie Mark	HEW/USOE/DAE	245-9751
Barbara Chandler	HEW/USOE/DAE	245-2949
Alice Scates	HEW/USOE/OPBE	245-8380
Charles Stalford	HEW/NIE	254-9497
Sue Bogner	HEW/OHD/OPE	245-3176
Mary E. Roach Higgins	CSRS/USDA	447-6435
Ruth Nickse	NIE	254-5530
Lawrence D. Haber	OMB	395-6132
Liane P. Davis	SRG	331-8706

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES IN ADULT LIFE
AS OUTLINED BY DR. ROBERT J. HAVIGHURST

Aspects of Adult Growth & Development:

1. Personal/Mental -
personality & cognitive development
2. Social Roles
3. Physiology (ie biology of aging)



Types of Activity

- | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|
| Work - Career (Parnes (OSU), Kahn) | | <p>INTERACTION</p> |
| Leisure | | |
| Education (Alan Knox, Cyril Houle, DeCrow, APA (Adult Education Assn. Survey)) | | |

Cross-Cultural Studies

1. Social Class - Warner et al/Kansas City Study of Adult Life
2. Ethnic Studies - Andrew Greeley/National Opinion Research Center, U. of Chicago
Michael Novak
3. Cross-National - Ethel Shamas et al/ U. of Illinois
Thomas Lehr, Havighurst, Munnich/U. of Chicago/retirement

Adult Learning

- Measurement - Wechsler
- Botwinick/U. Of Washington
- Senile Dementia
- Types of Adult Learning
Instrumental vs Expressive

Theories of Development after Age 40 - 50

1. Disengagement (Cummings & Henry)
2. Activity (Duke U. - Maddox)
3. Exchange (Dowd)

Longitudinal Studies

1. Terman - Oden - Sears - Cronbach
2. NIA (National Institute on Aging)/Baltimore; Shock, Creulich, Butler
3. Boston/Harvard; Fozard, Rose, VA (Veterans Administration)
4. Berkeley; Jones, Clausen, Haas Study
Berkeley; Jean MacFarlane

Future Research

1. Longevity - Life Span?
2. Labor Force & Energy Cost
3. Effects on Retirement Policy
4. Pre-Retirement Preparation
5. Age Distribution

Notes from the Meeting of the Interagency
Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood

October 12, 1977

The meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood was brought to order by Chairperson Justine Rodriguez at 9:44 a.m. The minutes of the last Panel meeting, held June 13th, were approved as submitted.

The Panel discussed possible activities and directions for the future. Among the interests raised by Panel members were: (1) the adult learner; (2) the impact of life-extension technology; (3) the "myth" of the extended family; (4) learning stimulation....how is this done in the context of life-long learning; and (5) occupational change as it relates to learning needs. It was suggested that the topic "adult learner" be the main agenda item for the next Panel meeting, followed by a meeting on occupational change.

Mr. Joseph Coates, Office of Technology Assessment, and Mr. Hal Wallach, Bureau of the Census, led a discussion on research issues that ought to be addressed now, in order to prepare for future problems of a population in and approaching retirement.

Mr. Coates observed that as a people we tend to look at the future in terms of the present. As a result of a lack of realistic images about the future, it becomes difficult to contemplate the effects an aging population will have, for instance, on organizations and bureaucracies as the average age of people in managerial positions moves from 38 to 48. The facts are that the population as a whole is aging. Thus there will be a greater proportion of the population in the "retirement years." This situation, coupled with the

fact that a significant number of elderly vote, emphasizes the need for more research on the needs of this group. It was suggested that research would also enable us to gather more basic information; to define and test institutional, social and political options as well as legitimize what is already known.

Several areas where present research is sketchy and where input is vital were outlined. It was noted that a primary need is to find out what life is like for the elderly as well as what mechanisms could be used to simulate real life experiences in order that a person might be trained to be more "effectively elderly."

Social isolation, both urban and rural, was cited as a high priority area. Present-day housing and care for many of the nation's elderly only serves to promote isolation. The need to study ways to effect a shift in tax and housing policies was emphasized. A related interest mentioned was to establish a conscious awareness of the elderly's needs architecturally. Other research areas of importance mentioned were: (1) sexuality and sex-ratio problems; (2) more effective delivery of public services; (3) problems of violent crime; and (4) services to inform the elderly of economic and commercial schemes so as to avoid fraud.

The subject of retirement suggests numerous areas where further research could be done. The question of productivity versus competency in older workers was raised. Also mentioned was the need to investigate the psychological and social effects of retirement as well as alternate ways of scheduling work. Mid-career transitions, the effects on the family, society's concern with physical well-being, the weakening sensorium of the aging and passive and active euthanasia were suggested as areas meriting further attention.

Mr. Hal Wallach, Bureau of the Census, presented demographic data that emphasized the need for more extensive research on the process of aging. He noted that over the next fifty years, 12-16 percent of the population will be over 65 years of age. Differentiating between young-olds (under 75 today) and old-olds (75 and over), he noted that future cohorts of these groups will have different life expectations than those of today. As a result more comprehensive programs and services will be necessary.

The effects of life experiences and maturation levels on aging were discussed. The results of some longitudinal studies have suggested that social isolation may age people more than maturation. Chronological age has been shown to be a poor predictor of adaptation paths. Research on this point was strongly recommended. It was felt that among the other pertinent research areas to consider were: (1) reduction and prevention of dependence; (2) income maintenance approaches; (3) mental health; and (4) nutrition.

In summary the Panel discussed the necessity to determine which research projects would lead to the best alternatives as well as those that would provide the most options. It was noted that research, in essence, should widen the choices, not define them.

Present at the meeting of the Adulthood Panel, October 12, 1977:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Cynthia E. Huston	Congressional Research Serv. (Futures Research Group) Library of Congress	426-6499
Bill Daniels	HEW/ASPE	245-2240
Philip E. Grossmann	HEW/APS/HDS	245-0877
Sue Bogner	HEW/OHDS/OPRE/DPD	472-7241
Al Duncker	HEW/OHDS/AOA	245-0004
Barbara Loe	HEW/OHDS/AOA	245-0004
Robert Calvert	HEW/NCES	245-8340
Barry Stern	HEW/ASE	245-8003
Manny Smith	HEW/ASPE	245-1882
Benjamin Schoenfeld	HEW/OPRE/OHDS	472-7236
Ruth Siegel	NSF/BNS	632-5714
Susan Nevas	HEW/ASPE	245-1879
Virginia Reno	SSA/ORS	673-5679
Jeanne Sclater	HEW/OE/BHCE	245-9868
Robert Eckert	HEW/NIE	254-5456
Edith H. Grotberg	ACYF/OHDS	755-7750
Alice Y. Scates	HEW/OE/OPBE	245-8380
Phil Austin	GWU	676-6685
Hal Wallach	Census	763-2588
Justine Rodriguez	HEW/ASPE	245-1878
Jim Coates	OTA	224-6019
Paul Delker	HEW/USOE	245-2278
Maure Hurt, Jr.	SRG/GWU	331-8706
Hilary Gardner	SRG/GWU	331-8706

Notes from the Meeting of the Interagency
Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood
December 6, 1977

The meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood was brought to order by Mr. Paul Delker, Acting Moderator, at 2:15 p.m.

The main agenda item was a special presentation on the Identification of Learning Needs of Adults by Dr. Winthrop Adkins, Director of the Life Skills Center, Teachers College, Columbia University, who discussed innovative approaches toward resolving the problems of identifying adult learning needs.

Dr. Adkins' presentation included an overview of his research as well as a description of a particular study his team conducted in Connecticut. His research in this field has spanned the last 14 years. He and his assistants have sought to identify the problems of people, especially educationally disadvantaged people, and to determine how the problems people have affect their employability. His research has involved analyzing delivery systems in order to find out whether the systems met the needs of the people they were intended to help. On the basis of his research, Dr. Adkins has developed a learning model and a system to create new programs based on this learning model.

Dr. Adkins noted that the complexity of people's problems prompted research and development on a more meaningful method to help people solve their problems. What was available in service delivery systems was not as comprehensive an approach as seemed necessary. All levels of an individual's

development needed to be considered including the educational, psychosocial, emotional and cognitive aspects. Through research some conclusions were reached: (1) that problems encountered in adult education were predictable and therefore a solution process could be anticipated and (2) that the counseling available was limited and that the counselors were not trained to cope with the problems of the people they encountered.

Working with his findings, Dr. Adkins outlined the steps that were taken to develop a functional process which would enable counselors to help disadvantaged adults to solve their own problems and enhance their employability. The formulated plan as described uses a problem center approach which incorporates stimulus for intellectual development. It was felt that by helping people to become more knowledgeable, behavioral changes would follow. Dr. Adkins in the course of his research had concluded that attitudinal change tends to follow behavioral change. The result of his research was a pre-designed package to aid in problem solving. Part of the focus was on a learning sequence. The package contained 10 units each based on a four-stage problem-solving process.

Dr. Adkins discussed a study conducted in a region of Connecticut between Hartford, Bridgeport and New Haven. The purpose of the study was to find out what problems people had and what a person needed to learn given the present system. Through interviews with residents of the area, he was able to categorize the problems and analyze the situation. One of the most striking discoveries was the massive fragmentation of services on the local level. Some recommendations for the future were suggested: that a study should be conducted to coordinate adult education for the disadvantaged, and more attention should be paid to the psychosocial learning needs of adults.

Dr. Adkins noted that his purpose throughout his research has been to create instructional ways to deal with problems without total reliance on counseling.

Dr. Adkins' presentation was followed by comments from a panel of invited discussants. The members of this panel were Mr. Judah Drob, Chief, Division of Research and Development Utilization, Office of Research, Department of Labor; Dr. Charles Bunting, Deputy Director, Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, DHEW; and Dr. George Pratt, Special Assistant for Education, Department of Commerce.

It was suggested that: (1) the creation of new constituencies at the Federal level concerned with delivery of services on the local level would help alleviate the present fragmented situation; (2) some new service programs are moving toward comprehensive person-centered services (3) groups other than the educationally disadvantaged merit a psychosocial analysis approach toward reduction of their problems; (4) there is a need to restore support services for people placed on jobs; and (5) there may be a need to provide incentives for counselors.

Other points raised by the discussants included changing the focus of lower level jobs. Instead of considering some positions as deadend situations, people should be counseled about the possibilities of obtaining better jobs through work experience. Also considered was the fact that many participants in adult education programs do not allow enough time to complete a comprehensive learning process. Discrimination among the disadvantaged was noted. Many disadvantaged adults have the capability to assist in counseling others on the same socioeconomic strata. This ability should be recruited and encouraged. It was also suggested that the relationship between job entry level requirements and actual ability to do jobs be explored further.

The Panel Chairperson, Justine Rodriguez, announced that the next meeting of the Interagency Panel on Adulthood was scheduled for January 10, 1978.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Present at the December 6, 1977 meeting of the Adulthood Panel:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Aeolian M. Jackson	ACYF/R & E	755-7758
Gloria Silverman	Clearinghouse ADELL	770-3000 x249
Sharon A. Jones	DAE/OE	245-2950
Alice Scates	OE/HEW (OPBE)	245-8380
Ned Bryan	DAE/BOAE/OE	245-9783
Robert Eckert	NIE/HEW	254-5654
Manny Smith	HEW/ASPE	245-1882
Edith H. Grotberg	ACYF/HEW	755-7750
Barbara Chandler	DAE/BOAE/OE	245-2949
Vincent Piper	HUD/NVACP	755-6585 or 6923
Chuck Bunting	Fund	245-8099
George Pratt	DOC	377-3387
Paul Delker	USOE	245-2278
Susan Nevas	HEW/ASPE	245-1878
Maure Hurt, Jr.	SRG/GWU	331-8706
Sue Bogner	HEW/OHDS/OPRE	472-7241
Mary Jane Dillon	HEW/OE/BHCE/DIE	245-2761
Jeanne M. Sclater	HEW/OE/BHCE/CSCE Program	245-9868
Bayard Clark	HEW/OE/Div. Adult Ed.	245-9761
Marjorie Keiser	CSRS/USDA	447-6435
Judah Drob	DOL/ETA/ORD	376-7258
Mary L. Ganikos	APGA	483-4633
Janice Weinman	HEW/OE/IOC	245-9248
Jessie S. Gertman	HEW/NIH/NIA	496-5597
Linda S. Hartsock	Adult Education Assn./USA	347-9574
Hilary Gardner	SRG	331-8706

Notes from the Meeting of the Interagency
Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood
January 10, 1978

The meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood was convened by Justine Rodriguez, Chairperson, at 9:40 a.m. The minutes of the Adulthood Panel meeting, held December 6, 1977, were approved as submitted.

Announcements:

Chairperson Rodriguez reported that an action paper has been written for more permanent financing of the Adulthood Panel. It is anticipated that by the next meeting of the Panel, more information will be forthcoming on the status of future funding.

The Panel was asked to consider the feasibility of a Spring Conference. Longitudinal Data Bases has been suggested as a possible conference theme. Members were also asked to consider whether the suggested theme would provide the kinds of information helpful to them and their agencies' goals. Discussion will continue at the next Panel meeting.

The main agenda item involved two special presentations on Occupational Mobility: Implications for Adult Development. Dr. Barry Stern, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, introduced the two presentors: Mr. Robert Stump, Acting Chief, Career Preparation Division, Education and Work Group, National Institute of Education, and Mr. John C. Crystal, Principal Consultant, Life Management Services, Inc.

Mr. Stump presented data on the degree of occupational mobility in the United States. Citing sources from Census and the Monthly Labor Review, he noted that there is substantial occupational change in the U.S. Labor market. The percentage of persons changing in any one year period is about 10%, but when one 5 year period 1965-1970 is looked at, about 30% of the working people had a different job in 1970 from the one held in 1965. Even in the age category 50-59 years old the rate is 25%. Mr. Stump pointed out that more often than not people change their field of occupation as well as their occupational title. This should be considered when evaluating the data. Rates of change indicated by past studies have provided some knowledge about the occupational mobility of adults, but future projections are difficult to make.

Education as it related to occupational change was also discussed. Mr. Stump emphasized the necessity of finding out what people need to learn in preparation for change in the working world. He noted that published job requirements frequently reflect educational attainment levels of the person or persons who have or are currently holding the position not some judgement of what the individual needs to be able to do. Mr. Stump discussed a study conducted by the Center for Vocational Education at Ohio State University that attempted to identify what are the transferable skills. The response showed a definite range of skills to considered transferable, but that successful transfer required more than learned skills. Many respondents mentioned aptitudes, attitudes and interpersonal skills as important requisites. The study pointed out that transferable skills can be identified, and noted that scholastic excellence does not always indicate ability

in other important traits (i.e., decision making, communication and creativity). The study also emphasized the fact that there are numerous programs teaching and developing transferable skills that can be useful in many jobs and occupations.

Mr. John C. Crystal, inventor of the "Life-Work Planning Process," discussed transferability of skills and occupational mobility and suggested some areas for future research. He agreed that it is difficult to project future patterns of change, but emphasized that he has found many people who are unhappy in their present work situations, do not know why they are there and wish to make a change. He noted that a lot of time and energy is being spent teaching and counseling individuals in career and life management.

Mr. Crystal noted that the concept of education, work and retirement has been viewed by our society as separate steps in the chain of life. As a result individuals feel that their lives are fragmented. He pointed out that this is not the case and that the idea of fragmentation needs to be overcome. A variety of skills are needed in order to cope with the job market of today. Some of these skills, Mr. Crystal noted, are taught in school, others are not. Our job hunting process has been viewed more negatively than positively. The assumptions are many concerning the inability to transfer skills from one job to another. Individuals are constantly confronted with the fact that taking on a new job later in life can mean starting at the bottom again. Mr. Crystal pointed out the importance of teaching people to cope with the world of work for pay as a basic step toward more effective career management.

Teaching people to "think" with respect to work, transferable skills and their own lives is the basis of Mr. Crystal's Life-Work Planning Process. Four major points of the system involved ask the questions: (1) Who am I? (2) What is the truth about the reality of the world of work? (3) What do I most want to accomplish with my life? and (4) How does one go about getting the job career he or she wants. Through his teaching process Mr. Crystal encourages his students to assess their own strengths, to assess the truth about the working world, to ask themselves questions about their life goals, and finally how to go about getting the job career wanted. Part of his process is to explain transferable skills rather than teach them. He noted that key decisions, in the final analysis, are often made on the basis of adaptive skills, which essentially emphasize the transferability of skills.

Mr. Crystal, commenting on the future, underlined the importance of evaluating job-related services in order to make sure that what is being done in fact does not hinder the process. He also noted the necessity of employing individuals who have discovered their transferable skills to teach others. Suggested areas of future research mentioned were studies to find out what services are available to enable people to become more mobile and studies of programs, concepts and approaches which assist specific populations (i.e., ex-offenders, minorities, etc.).

Dr. Stern, in summation, noted that a common theme throughout Adult Panel meetings has been the dilemma of individual empowerment versus

institutional empowerment. Thoughts for the future should include the question of where research emphasis is placed - on helping the individual adapt to work or on changing institutions to improve the opportunity structure.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Present at the January 10, 1978 meeting of the Adulthood Panel:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Paul Delker	USOE/BOAE	245-2278
Edith Grotberg	ACYF	755-7750
Barbara Chandler	DAE/BOAE/OE	245-2949
Manny Smith	HEW/ASPE	245-1882
Mary Ganikos	APGA	483-4633
Vincent Piper	HUD/NVACP	755-6585
Charles Stalford	NIE/F & P Group	254-9497
Marjorie Keiser	CSRS/USDA	447-6435
Dick Shute	OHDS	472-6757
Cynthia Huston	Futures Research Group	426-6499
Carnot Nelson	NIE	245-6070
Barry Stern	ASE/HEW	245-8003
Justine Rodriguez	ASPE/HEW	245-1878
Fred Best	Quality of Life Research Associates	965-9887
Robert Stump	NIE	245-8827
John Crystal	Life Management Services, Inc.	356-2630
Maure Hurt	SRG	331-8706
Hilary Gardner	SRG	331-8706

Notes from the Meeting of the Interagency
Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood
April 26, 1978

The meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adulthood was convened by Justine Rodriguez, Chairperson, at 9:45 a.m. at the Marvin Center. The minutes of the Adulthood Panel meeting, held January, 10, 1978, were approved as submitted.

Chairperson Rodriguez reported on the meeting with the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Education regarding future funding of the Adulthood Panel saying that the conclusion of the meeting was promising for long-term funding of the Adulthood Panel. If the Congress funds the Lifelong Learning Authority, the Office of the Assistant Secretary has said that it would be appropriate for some of the funding to support meetings and special activities of the Panel since one of the elements of the authority would be coordination of research and innovation in adult development among federal programs. There was also discussion of the possibility of NIE funding for extension of coverage of the IRIS/IRAS Data Base to fulfill the needs of the Federal Council on Research and Development (FCERD). Therefore, the Panel should have good long-term prospects if it can keep itself in a viable situation in the immediate future. Contributions from member agencies were solicited; they may be transferred by Interagency agreement to Charles Stalford of NIE who has agreed to manage the SRG contract.

Ms. Rodriguez then introduced Mr. Richard Werksman, National Institute of Education, who discussed the objectives of the new Federal Council on Educational Research and Development (FCERD). Copies of the legislation creating FCERD were distributed to Panel members. This legislation was part of the Education Amendments Act of 1976. The purpose of the Council is to ensure better utilization of the resources Congress makes available to agencies to carry out educational R&D. The first meeting of the Council occurred on April 18, 1978. As

you will note from the attached copy of the legislation, Congress named 7 agencies to the Council and designated the Director of the NIE as its Chairperson.

Mr. Werksman commented on the topics discussed during the first meeting of the Council. Firstly, the Council considered the need to clarify its relationship with the National Council on Educational Research (NCER). NCER, explained Mr. Werksman, is the statutory policy making body for the NIE. There is an apparent point of overlap between the two groups; both NCER and FCERD are required by law to submit an annual report on educational R&D in this country to the President and to the Congress. The outcome of discussion at the FCERD meeting was a possible plan whereby FCERD's annual report will be incorporated into the NCER report.

The second item discussed at the FCERD meeting was membership. Congress named to the Council 7 of the over 30 agencies which perform educational R&D. These 7 agencies represent 90% of the Federal dollars spent on research in education. They will seek to involve other agencies as well as provide information on the Council's activities.

The third item discussed was the Council's decision to establish three committees whose purpose would be to develop options to carry out the Council's mandate, which in turn would be presented to the Council for consideration. Representatives to FCERD will select individuals from their agencies to serve on these committees. There will be a committee to deal with each of the following: (1) the annual report; (2) recommendations of effective ways to carry out R&D and assessments of existing programs as required by the Congressional mandate; (3) administrative and legal problems of federal R&D agencies. The committees are expected to be formed shortly and will make reports at the next Council meeting.

Lana Muraskin, Education and Work, National Institute of Education, briefly described the NIE reorganization before discussing the Research

Agenda on Adult Education. Concerns with various aspects of adult education are specifically mentioned in the NIE reorganization plans as subsections within divisions of 2 of the 3 major groups being restructured--Education Policy and Organization (EP&O) and Teaching and Learning. Within Teaching and Learning is a subdivision called Home, Community and Work with adult learning as one of its three areas of interest. Two of the components of EP&O--Finance, and School Organization and Local Communities--have a specific postsecondary/adult sub-heading. The reorganization has been an opportunity for people who are interested in adult and postsecondary education at NIE to voice their concerns, and the staff has produced several documents in which they outlined some of the research that they would like to see undertaken. However, it is still a question as to whether or not these concerns will have an effect on the funding of research in this area.

Mr. Charles Stalford of NIE developed the Research Agenda on Adult Education, copies of which Ms. Muraskin distributed at the Panel Meeting. Ms. Muraskin said that the agenda primarily addressed the pending adult education legislation. The Research Agenda is divided into 3 major areas--participation in existing programs, delivery of services, and outcomes. In this working paper, Mr. Stalford cites several questions in connection with participation:

What groups constitute the target population for adult programs? Why is participation not higher? And, are adults getting their rightful share of tax and Federal dollars for the funding of education?

The following questions are raised under the heading of delivery of services:

What is the full range of programs available(public and private programs in addition to those funded under the Adult Education Act)? How do adults learn in various settings? And, how can better use be made of technological developments and the media in adult learning?

Current legislation links employment and the outcomes of adult education and training--is this link a reasonable one? In addition to this issue, Mr. Stalford addresses the question of the cost/benefit of adult education under the third

heading of outcomes.

Dr. Penny Richardson, Lifelong Learning Project, spoke to the Panel about the recent Lifelong Learning Report that has been submitted to Congress. She outlined the sections of the report which included the concept of lifelong learning as well as those sections with specific recommendations about adult research.

The conceptual part of the report dealt with lifelong learning from the learner's perspective rather than from an institutional perspective. Three elements that create a lifelong learning society were identified. They included: (1) learners who care about learning throughout life; (2) communities that are heavily endowed with learning opportunities of all types; and (3) public policy that would link learners to learning opportunities. The report also focused on the adult years, citing the fact that a great many inequities exist in the areas of funding and services provided. What role does the Federal government play in alleviating this situation? Secondly, if more attention is paid to the methods used by adult educators, what are the implications for the school system as a whole? Adult education occurs frequently in non-formal situations which have proved to be effective. Perhaps some of these methods and experiences can be integrated into the schools beginning with kindergarten and extending through twelfth grade to provide for a more comprehensive system of education. These were some of the arguments used to support focusing on the adult years.

Dr. Richardson described the second and third parts of the report. Section two dealt with Federal, State and local public roles in lifelong learning. This included the roles played, the problems encountered, and the approaches necessary to provide for adult learning on all three levels. In section three, the report sought to emphasize and clarify the vagueness of lifelong learning as a topic.

Several background papers were prepared for the report. Dr. Richardson noted that these papers proved to be very interesting, and there was some discussion on how to disseminate them. It was suggested that copies be sent to agency libraries

and/or SRG; hopefully, the papers will be available sometime in the near future.

Chairperson Rodriguez asked how the Panel could be helpful to members over the next six months, and several suggestions were made. Paul Delker, USOE, discussed the need to legitimize non-certificated learning and to develop means of measuring and reporting it. Sue Bogner, OHDS, suggested organizing Panel meetings around one topic rather than having one member discuss one agency. This theme approach would allow for a better flow of cross-agency information on a particular issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

Present at the April 26, 1978 meeting of the Adulthood Panel:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Paul Delker	USOE	245-2278
Robert Stump	NIE	254-8827
S. Macpherson Pemberton	OE	245-2825
Vincent Piper	HUD	755-6585
Lois Morrill	SRG	331-8706
Sue Bogner	OHDS	472-7216
Shirley G. Bricher	OE/OLLR	245-2813
Barbara A. Chandler	OE/BOAE/DAE	245-2949
Barry Stern	HEW/ASE	245-8003
Edward E. Lawders	DFA/OPRE/HEW	472-7228
J. D. Clemmens	OS/DASPE/E	245-7507
Lana Muraskin	NIE	254-6057
Penny Richardson	Lifelong Learning	632-6616
Richard Werksman	NIE	254-7924
Justine Rodriguez	ASPE/HEW	245-1878
Maure Hurt	SRG	331-8706
Ann DeArmon	SRG	331-8706

Federal Council on Educational Research and Development

At the present time there are several Federal agencies, such as the defense agencies, that have their own specific educational research and development programs. Through improved communication, information sharing and the interchange of similar interests, both items the Committee strongly endorses, better utilization of existing resources can take place.

The creation of the Federal Council on Educational Research and Development is the vehicle adopted by the Committee to improve the effectiveness of the total Federal effort in educational research and

development. This Council will be composed of a representative from every major Federal agency that deals with educational research and development and will be chaired by the Director of the National Institute of Education. The main functions of the Federal Council on Educational Research and Development will be to:

1. Report annually to Congress and the President on the status of Educational Research in the Nation. This will include the cataloging of all Federally assisted educational research and development programs.
2. Promote coordination between programs of the Institute and related programs of other Federal agencies.
3. Make recommendations to the Congress and the President on how best to disseminate educational information and research. This activity includes an assessment of existing Federal models for disseminating education research and information.

The Federal Council on Educational Research and Development is to have an advisory role in coordinating the policies and operations of the NIE with other Federal agencies. The Federal Council is to remain in an advisory status and in no way is it to interfere with the policy determinations of the National Council and the NIE.

94th Congress
2nd Session

House Report 94-1085
Page 76-77

LEGISLATION CREATING
THE FEDERAL COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"(g)(1) There is established within the Institute a Federal Council on Educational Research and Development (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Federal Council').

"(2) The Federal Council shall be composed of representatives of Federal agencies engaged in research and development relating to education, and shall include, but not be limited to, a representative designated by the Secretary of Defense, a representative designated by the Secretary of Labor, the Director of the National Institute of Education, the Director of the National Institute of Health, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Director of the Office of Child Development of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Commissioner of Education.

"(3) The President shall designate the Director of the Institute to be the Chairman of the Federal Council.

"(4) The President shall appoint additional representatives of Federal agencies and may alter the membership of the Federal Council from time to time as he considers necessary to meet changes in Federal programs or in the organization of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

"(5) The Federal Council shall -

"(A) advise, and consult with, the Director of the Institute with respect to major problems arising in connection with carrying out the purposes of the Institute;

"(B) promote coordination between the programs and activities of the Institute and related programs and activities of other Federal agencies, including the joint support of activities to the extent such support is appropriate;

"(C) make an annual report to the Congress and the President on the status of educational research and development in the United States, including (i) a catalog of federally assisted programs in educational research and development, (ii) a report of the most significant findings of such research and development; and (iii) recommendations with respect to the manner in which such Federal research and development efforts may be improved; and

"(D) make recommendations to the Congress and the President with respect to effective means for the dissemination throughout the United States of information relating to educational research and development, and carry out an assessment of existing efforts used by Federal agencies for the dissemination of such information.

Section 405(g) of the GENERAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS 20 USC 1221e(g)
PUBLIC LAW 94-482 - October 12, 1976.

NOTES FROM THE MEETING OF THE INTERAGENCY
PANEL FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON ADULTHOOD
JUNE 1, 1978

The meeting of the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adults was convened by Chairperson Justine Rodriguez at 9:40 a.m. The minutes of the Adult Panel, held April 26, 1978, were approved as submitted.

The Panel has been working toward developing a unifying theme which would serve as a basis for future activities and meetings. One suggested theme has been "Human Competence." The thrust of this meeting was to explore human competence from a health perspective. Dr. James Bernstein, President, Health Corporation, was invited to speak on this topic. Dr. Bernstein's presentation was followed by comments from a reactor panel composed of Dr. Jerry Turem, Office of Human Development Services, and Dr. Frank Corrigan, National Center for Education Statistics.

Dr. Bernstein discussed several issues during his presentation. They were: a definition of health; components of health competency; and the demands of implementing programs which are viable solutions to problems.

Dr. Bernstein founded the Health Corporation in order to pursue a strong interest in health competency for individuals of all walks of life, especially disadvantaged groups. He defined health as a point along a continuum where one moves away from illness and toward wellness. His aim has been to help people help themselves in solving their problems from a self-assessment perspective rather than a medical (doctor's) perspective. The program he developed which utilized computer technology, allowed the individual to determine his or her own degree of health competency. Once established, Dr. Bernstein's plan was to deliver remedial materials, using the same system, in order to promote

competency. Dr. Bernstein commented on the problems encountered in implementing his program, and described the difficulties he encountered in obtaining assistance from the Federal government.

In establishing a measurement for health, Dr. Bernstein described the seven components of his curriculum: individual responsibility for the health of oneself; awareness of health values; self-assessment of health; use of resources and the health care system; general health knowledge; demonstration of general health competence; and maintenance of health competence. The systems model employed would set up criteria for these competencies, measure them, and analyze the results.

Dr. Turem (OHDS) commented on the lack of consensus in our society on what constitutes health and what it is worth individually. He also noted that human competence is essentially what the government is concerned with, though the extent to which the competence issue is addressed from a public policy perspective is unclear. Where to invest energy and government resources is a point of further discussion. Dr. Turem concurred that each person should be competent in the care of oneself.

Indicative of a rising level of concern about health competency, Dr. Corrigan mentioned that NCES has, through its contract with the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), encouraged the development of a basic life skills assessment which includes health maintenance skills. The assessment was administered to high school students a year ago. Secondly, Dr. Corrigan noted that the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which has a membership of 25 countries, has identified a series of social concerns with health as a primary one. In addition to health, OECD's list of social concerns includes: individual development learning; employ-

ment and the quality of working life; time and leisure; personal economic situation; physical environment; social environment; personal safety; and administration of justice.

Dr. Corrigan raised a number of questions: What is the relationship between statistics on disease and health habits as opposed to health skills and values? Can useful leading indicators be derived therefrom? Are certain knowledges and skills reflected in one's health behavior performance or the application of these knowledges and skills? Where is the break in terms of defining the context for competencies? How does one establish or define "satisfactory" performance, knowledge or the like? How does one address them? How do you deliver them or get them across to people? These are some of the kinds of questions that need to be addressed, and, as Dr. Corrigan noted, OECD is illustrative of an organization which is beginning to address questions of health and health knowledge and the National Assessment is an example of an effort to assess health knowledge on the part of American youth.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Present at the June 1, 1978, meeting of the Adult Panel:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Telephone</u>
Thomas Hertz	SRG	331-8706
Edith Grotberg	ACYF/DHEW	755-7750
Jorie Mark	USOE/Adult Ed.	245-9751
Lawrence D. Haber	OFSPS/Statistics	673-7953
Frank Corrigan	NCES	245-1022
Susan Nevas	ASPE/DHEW	245-1879
Jerry Turem	HDS/DHEW	472-6755
Justine Rodriguez	ASPE/DHEW	245-1878

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Telephone</u>
Vincent Piper	HUD-CSA/NVACP	755-6585
Phil Stillman	HUD-CSA/NVACP	755-6585
Shirley Bricher	OLLR/OE	245-2813
Philip E. Grossmann	APS/OHDS/DHEW	245-0878
Ned Bryan	DAE/BOAE/OE	245-1336
Louis Anderson	BOAE/OE	245-2617
Jim Bernstein	The Health Corporation	331-0034
Hilary Gardner	SRG	331-8706